21104

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

CANADA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR...EDWARD...RICHARD.....SCHWARZ

TITLE OF THESIS...CLERGY...EDUCATION...AND.....
..THE....1925......UNION............
....

UNIVERSITY...ALBERTA...................................

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED.....M.A.............

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED......1974......................

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed)..Dr. E.R. Schwarz

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

3603...BEAVER..RD N.W
CALGARY., ALBERTA.
.......T2L1W9........

DATED..5 APRIL..........1974

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CLERGY EDUCATION AND THE 1925 CHURCH UNION

by

© EDWARD RICHARD SCHWARZ

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1974

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Clergy, Education, and the 1925 Church Union" submitted by Edward Richard Schwarz in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Lewis H. Thomas
Supervisor

C.J. Mackinnon

W.G. Thomas

R.D. McMaster
External Examiner

Date. 15 March 1974

ABSTRACT

The educational policies of the churches that formed the United Church of Canada in 1925 have not previously been examined in depth despite the important roles played by the ministers in the life of these churches and in the achievement of church union.

This study notes the impact of international trends in denominational relations and scholarship upon the Canadian churches. Attention is also given to the general features of Canadian life which affected the churches. These were "nationalism," "metropolitanism," "frontierism," and "urban-industrialization." Denominational affairs are analyzed using the organizational concepts of "church" and "sect" and the ideological categories of "conservative," "liberal-reform," and "orgiastic-chiliast."

The Presbyterians, united in 1875 for the purposes of missionizing the West and resisting Roman Catholicism, experienced few serious internal tensions as all parties to the union were "church" experienced. Ideologically the Presbyterians were "conservative" or "liberal-reform" but the latter view of the majority was enabled by circumstances to dominate the church uniformly. The Methodists, united in 1883 by desires to broaden the union of 1874 and to correct organizational problems that had plagued the participants in their Western work or which had threatened their institutional survival, experienced greater internal tensions as some parties to the union were "sectarian" in experience while it was evident that the goals of the union could be achieved only by a "church" institution. Moreover all

three ideologies were represented in Methodism. The more prevalent "liberal-reform" view was frequently challenged by "conservatism" culminating in the 1910 episode which threatened to split the church. Thereafter "liberal-reformism" was secure. In both churches the policies affecting the training of ministers and the colleges reflected "church" and "liberal-reform" views. However by 1902 it was evident that the churches were failing to meet the needs of the agricultural West or of the lower income urban population in the East despite numerous organization adjustments and revised training programs. Little heed was given to the need of these areas for work of a "sectarian" and "orgiastic-chiliast" approach and interdenominational union was proposed as a solution.

This attracted the interest of the Congregationalists who were similarly failing in these phases of work and were in serious decline. The Congregationalists were "liberal-reform" and "church" oriented but had been forced by circumstances into a "sect" role. Numerous factors delayed the union and the three churches made further internal adjustments and engaged in various cooperative efforts to solve their problems. In the process the practices and organization of the churches became more similar. The effective limits of these approaches were reached in the 1920's but the problems persisted. To break the deadlock, the unionists identified their cause with the nationalistic feeling then sweeping the country and carried their churches into the union of 1925 despite vigorous opposition by a sizable element of Presbyterianism and lesser numbers of unorganized Congregationalists and Methodists. The resulting

United Church of Canada was the product of "liberal-reform" efforts to create a church capable of serving the religious needs of the nation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

INTRODUCTION. 1

I. INTERNATIONAL TRENDS IN RELIGION AND CANADA 4

International Trends in Religion. 4

Denominational Relations. 4

Christian Scholarship 12

The Canadian Context. 18

Nationalism 18

Metropolitanism 27

Frontierism 31

Urbanization-Industrialization. 37

Footnotes 44

II. THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH 56

Presbyterian Policies (1875-1910) 63

The Ministry. 64

The Colleges. 68

Presbyterian Policies (1910-1925) 84

The Ministry. 90

The Colleges. 97

Footnotes 120

III. THE METHODIST CHURCH. 129

Methodist Policies (1883-1910). 135

The Ministry. 135

The Colleges. 139

CHAPTER PAGE

Methodist Policies (1910-1925). 157

The Ministry. 165

The Colleges. 168

Footnotes 189

IV. THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH 198

Congregational Policies (1906-1925) 204

The Ministry. 204

The Colleges. 207

Footnotes 220

V. CONCLUSION. 225

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 243

INTRODUCTION

In 1925 the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches united to form the United Church of Canada. The event was unique in that it involved the crossing of denominational lines, whereas all previous unions in Canada and elsewhere had occurred only within denominational traditions. This distinctive feature has attracted the interest of historians, theologians, and sociologists who have produced numerous works upon the union and the denominations that participated in it. This study is intended to contribute to this body of literature in terms of both content and methodology.

The topic of this study is the policies of the churches that entered the 1925 Union pertaining to the training of men for the ministry and to the institutions established for that purpose. All previous studies of the Union or of the participating churches made reference to the significant role played by the ministers, but many made no reference to the training received by these men to prepare them for their office, while the remainder, because of their wide variety of interests or their format, did so in a perfunctory or limited manner. This study, then, will investigate an area largely neglected in the past and, by its concentration on an unusually narrow area of inquiry, will be able to employ a previously unused methodology.

Existing works on the Union or its participants fall into three general categories. There are numerous works on the individual denominations that entered the Union. Some of these are on specific subjects and make no reference to the topic of this study. Others are wider in scope and do not deal with the area to any significant extent. Moreover their very format precludes a comparative treatment of events in the other denominations. There are also few references to trends in the church at the international level or to any but the most dramatic events in the surrounding secular community. The works more directly concerned with the Union are generally based upon a comparative approach but in addressing themselves to a wide array of topics give a shallow treatment of many areas of policy and of the effect of external religious and secular influences. Finally, the works available on the colleges of the churches are generally so focussed upon the institutions themselves that little attention is given to external religious and secular influences, or even to events in the wider life of the parent denomination.

This study of the policy pertaining to the training of ministers and the colleges established by the churches that entered the 1925 Union dictates a comparative approach. At the same time a conscious effort will be made to relate this aspect of denominational life to other areas of importance, foremost among which was the view held of the ministry for which the men were being trained. This moves the study to a still broader level. These denominations were all part of the world-wide Christian community and hence affected by developments at the international level and, on the other hand, existing in a particular society, they were influenced by and, in turn, influenced that society. Limited space requires that careful selection of materials be exercised in presenting these two areas of external influence. The section on international trends in religion will deal with "denominational relations" and "Christian scholarship." The section on the Canadian context will be presented under the broad headings of "nationalism," "metropolitanism," "frontierism," and "urban-industrialization."

In moving from the more general to the specific, the study will first present the sections on international trends in religion and the Canadian context. This will be followed by a chapter on each of the "uniting" churches. The concluding chapter will draw together the lines of discussion developed in the earlier chapters.

CHAPTER I

INTERNATIONAL TRENDS IN RELIGION AND CANADA

Paul of Tarsus, of Biblical fame, was a member of the Christian church, which by its nature transcends national boundaries, and of a specific cultural group within the Roman Empire. Except in terms of both the wider religious and narrower national contexts, he defies explanation or understanding. Similarly the history of denominations in Canada must be considered in terms of the international trends in religion by which they affected either formally through administrative channels or informally through the immigrants who joined their ranks, and in terms of the national context in which they existed. The purpose of this chapter is to present this dual context of the denominations discussed in subsequent chapters.

1. INTERNATIONAL TRENDS IN RELIGION

While the period of concern is 1867 - 1925, reference will be made to earlier events which had an impact upon this period. The matters of importance will be considered under the broad classifications of "Denominational Relations" and "Christian Scholarship."

Denominational Relations

Denominations have been explained and/or classified as movements of protest,[1] according to institutional structures,[2] by their place in or attitude toward society or culture,[3] or by their ideology.[4] The last of these approaches is most useful for this study for it accomplishes many of the purposes of the others and also explains the changing views of denominations and the divergent views that occurred within individual denominations. In brief, this approach is based upon man's interpretation of the relationship between present existence and "utopia" and there are three basic positions that may be adopted by Christians. The first is "Orgiastic Chiliasm" which draws a sharp distinction between existence and the "other realm" or the Divine which can be crossed only by the Divine. This ideology is characteristic of the socially or religiously oppressed. "Liberal-humanitarianism" is essentially the reverse of this. "Utopia" exists in the future life but may also be achieved by the rationalization of existence. This is the ideology of the intellectuals and those rising or hoping to rise in the social order. "Conservatism" is a defensive ideology against "Liberal-humanitarianism" and is characteristic of those whose satisfying position in society would be jeopardized by change. In effect the preservation of the existing social order becomes a religious obligation. Henceforth these positions will be referred to respectively as "sectarian," "social-reformist," and "church."

Denominational relations are generally approached in two ways. The first emphasizes the character of the church and takes two forms which may be termed "inclusivism" and "exclusivism." "Inclusivism" emphasizes that which is common to the whole church. Thus Christ becomes the focal point around which all Christians may rally. The myriad of divisive factors which have found expression in denominationalism are to be actively combatted. This approach is idealistic and discounts the strength of the forces contributing to denominationalism. "Exclusivism" rationalizes the paradox of denominational divisions and the common elements of loyalty to Christ and the ethic of love by attributing Divine sanction to a particular denomination while assuming that all others have gone astray through wilfulness or ignorance and are therefore to be hated or pitied respectively. The other basic approach to denominational relations emphasizes situational need and may be described as "cooperative." This approach neither deplores nor glories in denominationalism but assumes that Christians should work together for the solution of problems. Initially this approach took the form of associations of individuals having common concern in very limited areas. Later denominational cooperation occurred when "exclusivism" was broken down by the appearance of problems of such scope or immediacy as to exceed the possibility of solution by denominations working in isolation.

The earliest form of "inclusivism" was the "Alliance" movement which first appeared in England in the 1840's. Its theory was largely borrowed from an unsuccessful movement in the United States in the 1830's to unify Christianity on the basis of the Apostles' Creed, a "United Protestant Creed," and mutual acceptance of sacraments and ministries.[5] To this the English movement added the purpose of combatting Roman Catholicism and made plans for future world Alliance meetings.[6] Almost immediately the movement became dominated by the concern to resist Roman Catholicism and its more constructive aspects became secondary. Alliances were soon organized in other European countries having sizable Protestant populations and an Alliance was organized in Montreal but it was shortlived. so inhospitable were its surroundings.[7] Two decades later, in 1867, Alliances were formed in Toronto and New York and the movement quickly spread in both Canada and the United States. The Canadian Alliances achieved a national organization in 1874. The Dominion Alliance was militantly anti-Roman Catholic, especially in its French-speaking elements which persisted longest after 1918 when the movement ceased to function on a national basis.[8] As planned, several world Alliance meetings were held: Berlin (1857), Geneva (1861), Amsterdam (1867), and New York (1873). However interest was rapidly shifting to denominationalism of a new dimension and this was followed by a new concern for social reform.[9]

By the turn of the century, the Alliance as an international force was dead and had been replaced by national federations of Protestant denominations. The objectives of the federations varied from country to country but as they had social and economic overtones, they received little or no support from the highly sectarian denominations and insofar as their programs generally resembled that which had first been developed in the United States, neither the Roman Catholic nor the Orthodox churches were attracted to the federations. Such federations were formed in England, the United States, Switzerland, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries by 1910.[10] Canada did not share the federation experience until 1944, long past the period of interest. After 1900 the Canadian denominations that had contributed many members to the Alliance movement and which presumably would have promoted federation were involved in Church Union negotiations which, in their eyes, represented a greater goal.

In the mid-nineteenth century the denominations, as before, each claimed that they alone were the "true" church. The basis for this claim, of course, varied greatly between the denominations and even within the denominations there were significant differences of opinion. Roman Catholicism placed great emphasis upon its international character but contained elements that strove for a more national orientation. Through a series of doctrinal pronouncements which were confirmed by a Council called in 1869, the Pope became not only the administrative head but the source of "infallible" pronouncements on faith and morals. By vesting such authority in its chief officer, Roman Catholicism moved to the limit of centralized and international exclusivism.[11] The experiences of Orthodoxy after the schism of 1054 increased its exclusivism and isolation. The Turkish Moslem conquests of the fifteenth century relegated the parts of Orthodoxy under its control to the role of a persecuted minority and this enabled the Russian church to assume great prominence in Orthodox circles. However the Tsars, especially Peter the Great, forced Russian Orthodoxy into a position subservient to the state. This became the pattern in the Balkan states as they achieved their independence during the nineteenth century.[12] Thus Orthodox exclusivism differed from that of Roman Catholicism in that the former was nationalistic while the latter was international. The Roman Catholic "exclusivist" attitude toward the various Protestant groups that emerged in the sixteenth century was responded to by an equally harsh defensive "exclusivism." In a very short time "exclusivism" came to characterize relations between the various Protestant traditions and it subsequently characterized relationships between factions within the various traditions that were created by a variety of issues. By the 1850's none of the Protestant churches could claim to be truly international and few could even claim to be national. Such a condition hindered the denominations in their witness, mission work, and resistance to Roman Catholicism. To overcome this, several Protestant denominations organized world meetings to serve as a forum for witness and the exchange of views. It was explicitly stated that the gatherings had no control over the affairs of member churches. Such gatherings were begun by the Anglicans in 1867, the Reformed or Presbyterian churches in 1875, the Methodists in 1881, the Congregationalists in 1891, and the Baptists in 1905. As intended, these meetings encouraged reunions within the denominations at the national level. Canada was unique in this regard in that reunions were effected by the Presbyterians in 1875, the Methodists in 1883, and the Congregationalists in 1906.[13]

Discussion of the "cooperative" approach is complicated by the vast numbers of societies formed for so many specific purposes and the innumerable variety of arrangements made between individuals, denominational agencies, and even secular organizations and governments. Hence only the most prominent areas and a minimum of examples can be considered. "Cooperative" activities are readily divided into the broad categories of "evangelism" and "social service," the former being concerned with matters of the spirit and the latter with matters physical, moral, or mental. In rare cases there were overlapping concerns. Attention will be first given to "evangelism."

Sunday Schools for the purpose of evangelizing and educating working children first appeared in England in the early 1780's, and by 1785 a society was formed in London to spread the movement throughout the Empire. So effective was the institution that it was soon adapted to denominational purposes. The movement spread to the United States in 1824 and to Canada in 1836. By 1880 the various Canadian societies had assumed a territorial organization and after the 1914-18 War, a national organization. The involvement with the Americans dating from 1872 was gradually expanded to participation in the World Sunday School Association formed in 1907.[14]

Cooperative recruitment and support of missionaries appeared in England in 1795, Scotland in 1796, Holland in 1797, France in 1818, Denmark in 1821, Switzerland in 1822, and Germany in 1824. An American society for this purpose was founded in 1810 but it was not until 1854 that the Canadian Foreign Missionary Society was founded and it was shortlived as its members soon turned their energies to denominational missionary work. Efforts in the 1880's to recruit workers in the universities led through several stages to the formation of the international "World Student Federation" in 1895. A broader international approach to missions was begun with the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference in 1910. A continuing committee of the conference did such notable work in supporting missions "orphaned" during the 1914-18 War that its work was continued by the International Missionary Council formed in 1921. Over the years cooperative mission work became generally accepted save by the Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and highly sectarian Protestant churches.[15]

The publication of religious literature and the Bible was also an area of "cooperative" activity. The widespread use of the King James version of the Bible and the policy of avoiding interpretation enabled Bible societies to attract far wider support than Tract societies which had a continuing problem in the loss of support to denominational publishing agencies when such were formed. In Britain Tract and Bible societies were formed in 1799 and 1804 respectively. Similar societies were founded in the United States in 1816 and 1825. Branches of the British Bible Society were organized in Quebec in 1804 and in Nova Scotia in 1813. Tract societies began to appear in Canada after 1832. Their early wide functions and support declined after 1900 as the denominations increasingly produced their own supplies and public libraries became more common.[16]

"Social service" activity reflected a shift in responsibility from the state to the public and from the use of legal enforcement to the power of persuasion. Some societies, such as the "Society for the Suppression of Vice" formed in Britain in 1802, had multiple objectives; others were more specific in their interests. Some societies, notably the temperance and anti-slavery, were divided over the issue of encouraging the state to support their objectives. While collectively the societies had tremendous impact upon society at large, only the Y.M.C.A. achieved a high degree of unity and international organization. By 1900 "social service" work was experiencing great change. There was more concern for correcting causes than repressing the symptoms of social ills, state assistance was more openly courted, and denominational agencies were reorganized or created to work in the field and cooperation among these agencies quickly followed. Such occurred in Canada with the 1907 formation of the "Moral and Social Reform Council." Similar bodies appeared in the United States in 1908 and in Britain in 1911. While interests varied from country to country, the national councils generally served to coordinate the preventative and curative work of the member agencies. Much educational work was involved to overcome the conservatism of member bodies or elements therein in regard to specific issues. The early years saw great emphasis upon the problems of individuals--poverty, drink, gambling, and sexual vice--and tentative interest in industrial conflict, and capitalism and socialism. The 1914-18 War made obvious the need for a new approach. In 1925 an international conference on "Life and Work" was held in Stockholm. While not attended by the Roman Catholic, Orthodox, or high sectarian Protestant churches, it did provide an international forum for "cooperative" social service activity. Provision for future meetings and work was assured by a continuation committee. The conference also served to clarify the strikingly divergent trends in theological thought and to this attention must next be given.[17]

Christian Scholarship

Christian scholarship during the period 1850 - 1925 was carried on in a world that was experiencing change at a fantastic rate. Secularism in politics and government had been a long recognized fact but never before had it reached the level found in Soviet Russia after 1917. Economics had long been secularized but never before had such power and influence been concentrated as it was in the modern corporation. Industrialization became more widespread and refined. Unprecedented levels in standards of living were experienced but this was accompanied by a host of serious social problems. Science made marvellous contributions to human welfare but applied to warfare it produced horror unimagined before 1914. New theories and techniques emerged in all areas of thought. Some were contradictory to older views and even to each other, but at every point they presented challenges to the views of the Christians.

Christian scholarship during the period was characterized by four basic divisions: eastern European Orthodox, southern European or Latin Roman Catholic, north-western European Protestant, and English-speaking Protestant. At the same time, while each of these had a general ideological position largely imposed by their circumstances, they each contained elements holding other ideologies. The survival of these elements within the denominations was dependent upon the degree of divergence and the effectiveness of the means within the denominations to enforce uniformity of views.

During the period of interest over eighty per cent of Orthodox Christians and the vast majority of Orthodox scholars and intellectual centers were in Russia, while the main part of the rest were in Turkish-controlled areas. As both the Tsars and the Turkish authorities regarded efforts to change society as tantamount to treason, "social reformers" found their views subject to persecution if not fatal. Some individuals holding "sectarian" views found satisfaction in Orthodox monasticism. Orthodox scholarship remained essentially conservative in attitude but it became more intellectual in that German idealism was employed as a support for existing attitudes and practices. So also were the results of renewed study of the Greek Church Fathers employed, but this further isolated Orthodoxy from Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The 1917 Bolshevik Revolution caused a crisis in Orthodoxy. Its principal support was gone and its conservative approach was no longer relevant; indeed it was an embarrassment in relations with the new government. Meanwhile Russia was torn by civil war and economic disruption and the Orthodox church had no answers for its people. Many left to join the sect churches, especially the Baptist, which had long experience in serving people who found the conditions of life so hostile and hopeless of improvement that rising above them seemed the only answer.[18]

Roman Catholicism, like Orthodoxy, was conservative in its attitude. However its conservatism was motivated by the desire to regain its medieval status of being superior to all nations and the supreme authority in religious and moral affairs. Moreover Roman Catholicism was sufficiently flexible to accommodate individuals who wished to withdraw from the world or to devote themselves to social service activity in the wide array of religious orders. Further, Roman Catholicism had a long tradition of interest in scholarship and education. However, all these factors were channelled in support of the status and authority of the church and the premises of tradition and Scripture upon which they were based. The questioning of these had been a major factor in the sixteenth century Reformation.

The Council of Trent reaffirmed the old position and there the matter rested until the 1850's.

The 1870 Vatican Council confirmation of the 1854 papal bull "Ineffabilis" and the 1864 "Syllabus of Errors" had the effect of making papal pronouncements supreme in matters spiritual, political, and social, and it turned the church against the objectives and methods of modern scholarship. In order to foster unity in Roman Catholic scholarship, the Papacy adopted Thomism in 1879 as the only acceptable intellectual approach. Such scholars as persisted in employing other methods were characterized as "modernists" and were regarded with suspicion. As "modernism" spread geographically and expanded its interests, the suspicion grew until it assumed the character of a "witch hunt" in 1907. By 1910 the "modernists" had been hounded out of the church or driven underground and an anti-modernist oath was required of all Roman Catholic clergy and teachers. Despite the subsequent isolation that resulted, Roman Catholic circles rejoiced in the enhancement of Papal authority and the apparent unity of Roman Catholic scholarship.[19]

Continental European Protestant scholarship in the post-1850 period was an almost exclusively German affair. The situation was unique in a variety of ways. Despite the extreme conservatism of the state and the churches generally, the scholars in the universities experienced unparalleled academic freedom. In part this is explained by the interests of the scholars which in no way seriously challenged existing conditions. The scholarly interest until the 1870's remained with the work begun in the early years of the century on the issue of relating faith and culture in a single intellectual framework. Thereafter interest was focussed upon very narrow areas of study. The thoroughness of some of the massive works produced in this period has not been equalled since and they remain landmarks in scholarship. The shattering impact of the 1914-18 War redirected scholarly energy. For some this meant a search for the meaning of faith in order to bring it into judgment upon culture that could produce such carnage and destruction. For others it meant a search for new theological systems less reliant on culture. Still others delved into the Scriptures for a glimpse of the Divine as such was not to be otherwise experienced in such a depraved world. In effect German scholarship had moved from an active or passive conservatism to an almost sectarian position.[20]

The context of English speaking Protestant scholarship differed radically from that of continental Europe. In both Britain and North America a series of religious revivals had followed the period of heavy rationalism and had grown into a tradition of evangelistic and social reform activity. Such prevented the forming of rigid denominational lines as were found in Europe, but they also fostered a sense of religious individualism based on Biblicism and this undermined the concepts of corporate church life and tradition. On the other hand denominational control of scholarship was more effective than in the continental churches. The introduction of the results of German scholarship into the British churches in the late 1800's and the popularization of Darwin's theories created a crisis in that the Biblical basis of the faith appeared to be crumbling. In defense the British turned to heresy trials to silence the new views and plunged more deeply into social reform activity. In a sense this was moving to a closer identification of faith with culture. Some elements left the church. The 1914-18 War revealed the poverty of this approach and still more people left the churches. Scholars hastily turned to a review of the nature of church and society. In 1924 the "Conference on Politics, Economics, and Citizenship" was held in Birmingham and the British churches played a major role the following year at the "World Conference on Life and Work" in Stockholm. Neither indicated that British Protestantism had found an adequate theology for the times. A similar shock occurred when the new theological studies reached the North American churches. Heresy trials occurred in the major churches--Congregational, Presbyterian, Methodist, Episcopalian, and Baptist--between 1880 and 1920. The Canadian experience will be discussed elsewhere. The overall result was a polarization of opinion that made denominational differences seem mild indeed. At one extreme were those elements that eagerly embraced the new theological scholarship. Included, of course, were those seminaries which had striven for and achieved independence from denominational control during the heresy difficulties. Also present were those who were vitally interested in social reform. The theological position of this latter element was articulated by W. Rausenbusch in his 1917 *A Theology for the Social Gospel*. The other extreme was even less homogeneous. It contained elements that retreated from the new scholarship into a hard confessionalism, others that held strongly to the theologies of indigenous sects, and still others of the new "Fundamentalism." Beginning in the 1870's a series of "Bible Conferences" had been held by individuals interested in Biblical literalism and revivalism. In 1895 they adopted six non-debatable "fundamentals" of faith: the literal truth of Scripture, the deity of Jesus Christ, the Virgin Birth, the substitutionary theory of the Atonement, the bodily Resurrection, and the imminent bodily Second Coming. In the period 1909 - 1915 these points were elaborated in a twelve-volume work entitled, *The Fundamentals*, and distributed to all the clergy and Y.M.C.A.-Y.W.C.A. personnel in the United States. The lines were thus drawn between modern scholarship in association with social reform and confessionalism associated with Biblical literalism cemented together by social conservatism and sectarianism.[21]

2. THE CANADIAN CONTEXT

The period to be considered is 1867 - 1925. While slightly longer than the longest "national" period of the denominations of interest, this period includes Confederation which provided the geographic setting for the later events, was founded on conditions which had profound effects upon later social development, and which influenced the thinking of the churches. The chapter will consider the factors of nationalism, metropolitanism, frontierism, and urbanization-industrialization as these profoundly influenced the life and form of the churches.

Nationalism

Prior to 1867 the British North American colonies were marked by diversity of language, culture, religion, and economic interests. Their common features were the imperial relationship and a measure of responsible government but the latter was of recent origin.[22] The union of the colonies would have to be, as was St. Paul, "All things to all men." Yet it was accomplished in a surprisingly short time because of urgent political, economic, social, and military problems.[23]

The union or confederation of the colonies was attractive as a solution to the land hunger problem as it would make possible the opening of the West to settlement, it would provide wider marketing opportunities, it would offer business opportunities as extensive transportation facilities would be required, and it would serve as a protection against the threat of flooding of the markets by American manufacturers.[24] Confederation was also regarded as a solution to the defense problem as relations between the United States and Britain and her colonies deteriorated and a repetition of the invasions of 1775 and 1812 appeared to be a distinct possibility. Moreover this was the age of "little Englandism" when Britain was determined to reduce the cost of its overseas commitments.[25] And finally, Confederation was expected to solve the political deadlock which was paralyzing the United Provinces of Canada. This situation was in large measure the product of tension between French and English speaking Canadian cultures. By assuring the survival of both, cooperation on other issues could be obtained.[26]

With little fanfare the British Parliament passed the British North America Act, effective July 1, 1867, which was intended to satisfy these many needs. Canada, consisting of the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, began its national existence. While the nature of its format has been a matter of controversy,[27] the intended character and goals of Canada were simple. It was to remain part of the British Empire, it was to be territorially and economically expansionist, and it was to be bi-cultural. During the major portion of the period under discussion political life was dominated by the success of the party in power in fulfilling these objectives. Failure or the appearance of failure led to the defeat of the Conservatives under John A. Macdonald in 1873,[28] the Liberals led by Alexander Mackenzie in 1878,[29] the Conservatives in 1896 when their problems were further complicated by a series of short-lived or grossly ineffective leaders,[30] and the Liberals led by Wilfrid Laurier in 1911.[31] The 1914-18 War needs resulted in an interlude of Union government dominated by the Conservatives under R. Borden. Peace brought an end to the partnership and failure to resolve the old problems led to the defeat of the Conservatives under A. Meighen in 1921.[32] Agricultural problems in the post-war period and disenchantment with the existing parties resulted in a sudden growth of political agrarianism both at the provincial and federal government levels but its effectiveness at the federal level was nullified by the skillful manipulation of the Liberals.[33] This factor and ineffective tactics by the Conservatives enabled the Liberals under W. L. M. King to retain power from 1921 beyond the period of interest. This period of Liberal rule marked the end of grandiose schemes such as Macdonald's "National Policy" and slogans such as Laurier's Canada's "Twentieth Century" and the introduction of federal campaigns fought by candidates on local or regional issues. A measure of national cohesiveness was provided by catering to anti-colonial feeling. King was successful in having the "de facto" independence of Canada recognized by the 1926 Imperial Conference and this was formally stated in the 1931 Statute of Westminster.[34] King's policy of an independent Canada in association with Britain was, in large measure, shaped by the success and failure in the achievement of the goals of Confederation.

Territorially the major phase of expansion had been early completed. The area west to the Rocky Mountains and north to the Arctic Ocean, excluding Labrador, was acquired by 1870,[35] British Columbia joined Confederation in 1871,[36] and Prince Edward Island joined in 1873.[37] Newfoundland remained aloof from Confederation during the nineteenth century[38] and joined in 1949, long beyond the period of interest. However the success recorded in territorial expansion was not matched in economics in that the Maritimes and the West lagged behind central Canada and were increasingly dissatisfied with their relatively slower rate of economic progress.

In considering bi-culturalism, several factors must be noted. Both the French and English speaking groups had grown apart from the European parent nations. In part this resulted, especially for the French, from isolation from European events which affected the parent nations, and in part from the experience of life in North America, and from contact with each other.[39] Further, neither group was homogeneous, although the French group was more so than the English, and over some issues there were surprising alliances or defections, depending upon the point of view, across the cultural line.

At the time of Confederation, the French Canadians[40] were basically conservative in their ideology. Initially the French Canadians had their language, religion, and civil law as the means to preserve their culture under British rule and the Roman Catholic Church had served as a rallying point. As this suited the purposes of the Church, it soon took a leading role in preserving the French Canadian culture and made support of this objective a virtue if not a religious obligation for the laity.[41] Under the guidance of the Church, the schools and colleges of French Canada were revived and expanded and by the time of Confederation were powerful forces in the maintenance of the culture.[42] Similarly the church actively and successfully opposed political activity other than that devoted to maintaining French Canadian culture and the Church's position in society.[43] This success was reflected in literary and philosophical revivals which in turn encouraged further progress.[44]

Pre-Confederation "English Canadian" culture lacked the unifying bonds of religion, traditions, customs, and even language that played such important roles in French Canada, but it did have a common view that life under the Union Jack was preferable to life under the Stars and Stripes. It has been described as a culture "Anglo-Saxon in origin, English speaking without a British accent, and Protestant;"[45] however, this suggests a religious unity that did not exist. In accommodating its Roman Catholic element, English Canada had adopted the approach to religion that was least offensive to the majority of its people. Ideologically English Canada in its several geographic parts was liberal-humanitarian. This was reflected in politics,[46] in the repudiation of an "established church,[47] and in education.[48] At all levels of education English Canada turned from an "establishment" to a "non-sectarian" approach while permitting a measure of choice by means of the "sectarian" private or separate schools and the "sectarian' colleges.

With Confederation, French and English Canadian relations became affected by four new factors.--Roman Catholic affairs were increasingly directed by the clergy in Quebec rather than Rome and this was paralleled by the rise of influential centers in other parts of Canada. The effect of this was the breaking, outside of Quebec, of the bond between French Canadianism and Roman Catholicism. Second, the B. N. A. Act contained clauses protecting minorities and defining provincial rights. As events proved, the majority populations in the various provinces appealed to those sections which best served their purposes. Third, the spirit of moderation in both cultures was replaced by a romanticized fanaticism. The French Canadians looked back to the glories of New France and were fortified by the high papalism of the 1860's and '70's, while the English Canadians were fired by visions of an ever greater British imperialism and a spirit of rabid anti-Roman Catholicism. And finally there were the new acquired territories and later new provinces which posed entirely new problems.[49] Space permits only a partial listing of the issues that troubled French and English Canadian relations during the period: the Guibord Incident and the ruin of the Institut Canadien in 1874;[50] the Red River incident;[51] the 1871 "Programme" in Quebec;[52] the 1871 New Brunswick School Act,[53] the

the 1885 Riel Rebellion;[54] the Jesuit Estates settlement of 1889;[55] the issue of language, particularly in education, which began in the Territories and Manitoba and later spread to Ontario;[56] and finally, the ways and degree of Canadian involvement in British imperial activities.[57]

During the post-Confederation period the French Canadian community further expanded and refined, and found new supports for, its conservatism. To be sure the French Canadians were often disappointed in the results of their conflicts with English Canada but they felt increasingly secure in Quebec.[58] Thomism, with papal encouragement, was eagerly embraced and contributed to the further revitalizing and expansion of education,[59] and the two most potentially disruptive factors to existing conditions--cooperatives and labor unions--were successfully harnessed to the task of cultural survival.[60] Finally, historical writing was expanded and was increasingly marked by elements of racism and messianism.[61] Indeed French Canada increasingly regarded itself as having a sacred mission to enlighten and save Canada if not the world from the error of their ways.

While French Canada was so engaged, English Canada was assuming a character that encouraged the assimilation of immigrants. This involved a quality of blandness that affected literature,[62] art,[63] and philosophy.[64] Interest in history was increasing[65] but it was unable to achieve the high style or unity of purpose so prominent in French Canada.[66] In contrast, education, a powerful force in assimilation, was given much attention. By 1914 school attendance was compulsory throughout English Canada but did not become so in French Canada until 1942.[67] Existing colleges and universities unable to offer programs in the rapidly expanding sciences or to meet the demands of the professional or business communities entered various forms of federation and the state assumed new and significant responsibilities. The West adopted the principle of a single state-supported university in the interest of economy and efficiency.[68] The churches also attracted attention either as a means of assimilation or of maintaining a measure of identity. Several pre-Confederation trends in religion were found effective in serving these purposes and so were vigorously encouraged. Centralization was achieved by the Presbyterians, Methodists, Anglicans, and Congregationalists, and the Lutherans organized national synods recognizing ethnic and theological differences.[69] Cooperation in social service culminated in the 1907 formation of the Moral and Social Reform Council of Canada, later called the Social Service Council of Canada. Cooperation in evangelism continued in the formation of community churches, many of which, after 1904, adopted the proposed basis of union of the United Church. The majority of the local union churches entered the union in 1925.[70] The outstanding example of cooperation was the Forward Movement. Moved by their experiences of cooperation in the 1914-18 War, the Anglican, Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches joined in a campaign to lay the foundations for doubling regular church support in the future and to raise $12 millions for immediate mission, educational, and benevolent purposes.[71] Unification within denominational families proceeded rapidly. This differed from centralization in that it involved the reconciliation of differences over theology, polity, and views of society. Such was achieved by the Presbyterians in 1875, the Methodists in 1884, and the Congregationalists in 1906.[72] In 1925 unionism across denominational lines was achieved by these three churches, the first such union in history. The event was prompted by the social-reformist elements of the three churches which saw it as the means to solve the problems created by urban industrialization and the opening of the West. Moreover some unionists, aware that their views were similar to those of the majority of English Canadians, were hopeful that the United Church would become a kind of "national" church although without special privileges or subsidization. Anti-unionists were of two kinds: "conservatives" satisfied with their situations and resentful of change, and "sectarians" convinced that nothing could be done to improve society. The former were mainly Presbyterians and constituted themselves as the "continuing Presbyterian" church, while the latter, mainly Congregationalists, drifted into existing sect type denominations.[73] Finally, sectarianism continued in the post-Confederation period but it differed in that new bodies appeared to replace earlier ones that had acquired "church" qualities and several were oriented to the new urban-industrial situation.[74]

Culturally French and English speaking Canada had moved further apart but they shared a common dislike for all control or appearance of control from outside their own cultural group. Indeed both elements had supported the 1919 request to the Crown that no further titles be bestowed upon Canadians as such implied national subordination and was counter to the Canadian sense of democracy.[75]

To be sure the French were largely viewing affairs from the Quebec point of view but English speaking Canadians had similar regional or provincial feelings and it was these in addition to the common anti-colonialism that were so skillfully exploited by William Lyon Mackenzie King.

Metropolitanism

Metropolitanism, as an historical concept, is concerned with the organization and influence radiated by cities. It may be simple, involving one city and the surrounding countryside, or it may be complex, involving several levels of power between the principal city and the countryside. Influence is exerted through the control of communications, transportation, finance, and trade. It may also be transmitted through political, educational, ecclesiastical, or other institutions.[76]

The pre-Confederation years were marked by metropolitan competition at two levels. On the higher level London successfully defeated the efforts of Paris and Washington to dominate the areas that later became Canada. At the more regional level the outcome of the competition was less decisive. Halifax was unable to dominate the Maritimes because of the establishment of multiple colonies and was forced to share influence with Fredericton, Charlottetown, and St. John's, all being subordinate, of course, to London. Maritime Union proposals in the 1860's were intended to overcome this situation but were supplanted by the Confederation scheme.[77] The St. Lawrence-Great Lakes region experienced frequent changes in its center of political influence--Quebec City, Quebec City and York, Kingston, Montreal, and from 1849 to 1858 Toronto and Quebec City alternating every four years. Thereafter the region was governed until Confederation from Ottawa.[78]

The centers of economic power did not always correspond with the political centers, nor did they always respect political boundaries. In the Maritimes economic and political centers generally coincided except in New Brunswick where the political center was Fredericton while the economic center was St. John. In the St. Lawrence region the early center of Montreal found its area of economic influence circumscribed on the south by the United States and on the West after 1821 by the controls of the Hudson's Bay Company.[79] Moreover by the 1860's Toronto was showing signs of becoming a rival.[80]

Metropolitanism also had its effects upon the churches and their educational institutions. The Anglicans located their bishops in the various colonial capitols and major commercial centers. In 1857 Montreal became the metropolitan see. Similarly the Anglican colleges were established in Fredericton, York, and Montreal. The college at Windsor was in actual fact not an exception as the region was controlled by the Halifax elite through the presence of their estates and country homes. The Roman Catholics placed their principal officers in a similar manner but chose Quebec City as their metropolitan see. The Roman Catholic colleges were divided among language lines. The French colleges were dominated by Laval in Quebec City. The English colleges were located in Halifax, Charlottetown, Kingston, Toronto, and Ottawa and never experienced such a degree of centralization. The other denominations did not have permanent hierarchical officials but their more prominent clergy tended to gravitate to the same centers of influence and their colleges were located in such places as Halifax, Toronto, Kingston, Quebec City, and Montreal. This was closely paralleled by the location of the non-sectarian colleges in Halifax, Charlottetown, Fredericton, Toronto, and Montreal.

Confederation changed the situation. London's influence was channeled through Ottawa to the various provincial capitals. In a sense this was a demotion for Halifax, Charlottetown, Fredericton, and Victoria; a partial recovery of influence for Quebec City and Toronto; and later distinct advancement for Winnipeg, Regina, and Edmonton. In the economic sphere the issue was clearly between Montreal and Toronto. Initial success went to Montreal in the form of control of the C.P.R. which, not surprisingly, was built with its lines far to the north of Toronto. However Toronto later closed the gap by obtaining railway links with the West. Each city had its advantages--Montreal had an ocean port and longer experience; Toronto had a Great Lakes port and was closer to the West. It was increasingly evident that neither could totally dominate the economy but both had visions of greatness--Toronto looked to the future as the business center of Canada;[81] Montreal saw itself as the center of North America.[82] The other cities were limited to competition for regional advantages although the opening of the Panama Canal in 1914 gave Vancouver access to both Europe and the Orient. Vancouver, like Montreal, had the feature of being the connecting link between ocean shipping and railway transportation.[83]

In ecclesiastical affairs metropolitanism became increasingly apparent as the various denominations became more national in scope. Denominational offices for missions, publications, and social service as well as meetings of importance were usually in Toronto. It is significant that the 1875 meeting which united Presbyterianism was held in Montreal, while the 1925 Union was consummated in Toronto. Regional meetings also gravitated to the larger centers as did the various church colleges. Winnipeg and Vancouver proved very attractive in regard to the latter. The provincial universities in the West were all located in centers of government or commercial importance--Winnipeg and Edmonton, Saskatoon and Vancouver. In Ontario the University of Toronto was successful in attracting smaller colleges from small centers and Dalhousie had similar but more limited success in Nova Scotia.

By 1925 the three major centers of influence were Ottawa, Montreal, and Toronto. Ottawa, of course, had great political influence although French Canadians tended to think in terms of Quebec City which was the capital of the most obviously French Canadian province and the center of French Canadian religion and education. Montreal's influence was primarily commercial but it was national in scope and there were symptoms that its importance as an educational center for English Canadians would be paralleled by a new importance in French Canadian education. Toronto, like Montreal, had nationwide economic influence. Further it was the capitol of the largest English Canadian province, a major educational center, and the location of the denominational offices of the larger Protestant denominations.

Frontierism

As "metropolitanism" is concerned with the effects of cities upon the countryside, so "frontierism" is concerned with the effects of unsettled regions upon the settled areas.[84] In its pure form this concept deals with the effects of life in frontier areas with its lack of personal restraint and wide opportunity upon pioneers and the impact of these effects when transmitted back to the settled areas. This thesis is American in origin and requires modification when applied to Canada. In Canadian application the thesis has been broadened to include a variety of activities such as fishing, fur trade, lumbering, farming, mining, and pulp-wood cutting which have been carried on in part, if not totally, under "frontier" conditions. Further there have been few occasions when there has not been some measure, limited though it may have been, of government or company control over the activities. However the Canadian, like the American, frontier has attracted the adventurer, the failure, the eccentric, and the rebel elements of the population and these have self-reliantly modified institutions to meet their needs, often to the dismay of established authority in the settled areas.[85]

The fur trade, lumbering, and mining, although carried on at different times and places, had characteristics in common that differed radically from the agricultural "frontier." All presupposed the rapid exploitation of available resources followed by expansion into new areas. Hence mobility was more valued than settlement with its attendant institutions. Family life was virtually impossible and traditional standards of morality and behaviour were greatly modified if not ignored. So long as the "frontier" was close to agricultural areas it proved disruptive as the farmers often divided their efforts between cultivation of the land and "frontier" activity, and "frontier" attitudes and standards impinged upon those of the settlement. Later, when the "frontier" became more remote, professionalism in the figures of the "voyageur," "lumberjack," and "sourdough" emerged and these were less disruptive as they willingly passed through the farming communities on their way to the "bright lights" of the cities where they found a ready welcome for their easily spent money but not for their "frontier" attitudes which found expression in fighting, gambling, drinking, and sexual promiscuity.[86]

The churches, the only institutions interested in modifying life on the "frontier" and its effects, faced major problems. Only churches with highly developed administration could organize missionary work and only those with strong resources could support it, as little if any local support could be expected. In this regard the Roman Catholic and Anglican churches had great advantages although notable work was done by the mission departments of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches. Moreover the missionaries had to be men of outstanding stamina, courage, and dedication in order to meet the rigors of primitive living conditions, extensive travel demands, and the hostility of the "frontiersmen" to whom they often appeared as agents of unwelcome restraints. Yet, as evidenced by the unwillingness of the Indians to join the 1885 rebellion, they did have an impact upon life on the "frontier."[87]

The agricultural "frontier" in Canada differed from those already discussed in that people arrived with the intention of remaining and creating a community life to their liking. Hence, as productivity passed the subsistence level, interest in institutions beyond the family began to appear. Canada had three agricultural frontiers: the Maritimes, Upper Canada, and the Prairies, of which the first two preceded Confederation. In both cases the primitive conditions encountered during the early years by the settlers turned their interest toward "sect" forms of religion, much to the frustration and distress of the Anglican authorities in Halifax and York. As the Anglicans enjoyed significant privileges in ecclesiastical and educational affairs, they were "conservative" in their attitudes. As the rural population became more settled and prosperous they resented these privileges and, while some remained "sectarian" and uninvolved, some took a more "social reform" attitude in undertaking campaigns to obtain more equitable treatment.[88]

The post-Confederation development of the West was hindered by a variety of problems. Responsible government was delayed until 1897.[89] Lands were settled indiscriminately by the government and the railway,[90] while the Hudson's Bay Company withheld its land from sale in hope of better prices.[91] Transportation, markets and supplies were largely subject to policies established in Montreal and Toronto where there was no interest in diversification to alleviate the dangers posed to a grain economy by weather, pests, or fluctuating markets.[92] Life in the new areas was extremely difficult--housing was inadequate, diet was limited in variety and there were problems of storage, transportation was difficult, and the isolation of many homesteads resulted in incredible loneliness.[93]

The introduction of new grain varieties and raising of cattle in areas unsuited to cropping countered in part the problems of pests and short growing seasons, but prolonged drought or depression remained as threats.[94] Farmer organizations were formed in 1905 at the provincial level and these were united in 1910 in the Canadian Council of Agriculture to lobby for government regulation to protect the farmers. The organization of the grain dealers was countered in the post-World War period by the organization of wheat pools, usually on a provincial basis. In 1924 a farmer cooperative controlled Central Selling Agency was chartered. Farmers thus obtained the means to influence regulation and, if they chose, a voice in every stage from the production to the marketing of their products.[95] However transportation remained under the control of the East which vigorously resisted the development or use of railway outlets for western produce on Hudson's Bay or at Vancouver.[96] This drove many westerners into political agrarianism during the 1920's, both at the provincial and federal levels.[97]

The development of social institutions in the West was complicated by the presence, often in homogeneous groupings, of settlers from central and eastern Europe who had been attracted by vigorous recruitment programs and a mild homestead law[98] because this posed the question, not whether there should be schools, churches, and other institutions, but whether or not they should be agencies of assimilation.[99] The diversity of population and the impossible cost of maintaining a variety of schools convinced most of the population that a non-sectarian system supported by public funds was necessary. The latter would require the local control of public lands which had not accompanied responsible government in 1897 and thus new energy was added to the drive for provincial status.[100] Despite the financial difficulty schools were opened and became a powerful factor of assimilation to English Canadian language and culture. A continuing problem at the local level was attendance and a lack of adequate teachers.[101] When the western universities were opened they were staffed by easterners who naturally attempted to create an atmosphere and to establish standards similar to those in the eastern institutions. Such drew attention to the defects of western schools and to differences in social and cultural backgrounds.[102]

The West was not troubled in the development of its religious institutions by the issue of an "established" church. In some cases immigrants in homogeneous settlements imported clergy to serve their needs without any intention of evangelizing neighboring communities.[103] The rest of the task fell to those denominations having a high sense of mission, funds, leadership, organization, and personnel capable of meeting the problems of great distance and minimal local support. Such were the Roman Catholic, Anglican, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches.[104] Awareness of the problems had led to organizational changes in the first two, and unions in the latter two. Western mission work was complicated by several problems. Except for French speaking Roman Catholics, the missionaries were English speaking and so were regarded by the ethnic groups as agents of assimilation. Early conditions led the settlers to yearn for a sect type message which was foreign to such denominations as were capable of mission work. Even when conditions improved and the settlers became more reform minded, they retained the frontier appreciation for manly personal character and integrity above institutional status. Then, too, the missionaries were accustomed to strong local church support and were anxious to ease the burden upon the mission funds of their denominations. Hence denominational rivalry became rampant in prosperous areas while marginal regions were neglected. In all denominations there were tendencies among the workers to adapt to western needs. This was most successful in the Anglican and Roman Catholic churches with their western bishops and least in the Methodist and Presbyterian churches with their centralized eastern offices. On the other hand the social-reformist ideology of the Methodists and Presbyterians enabled them to cooperate in a variety of ways, including local Union churches. At two points the Methodists and Presbyterians encountered serious difficulty; in serving their non-English speaking congregations, and in their lack of flexibility necessary to support western demands for economic reforms. The result was the drifting of people into western "wings" of their denominations, or the movement of people into sectarian groups or away from religion altogether.[105]

After 1900, as reflected in magazine articles, there was growing recognition that the isolation, the endless hard work because of improper techniques and lack of labor, and lack of social and educational opportunities, were causing rural depopulation which in turn further accentuated the problems.[106] In seeking to solve the problems associated with the church, the Methodists and Presbyterians of the West became avid supporters of church union.

Urbanization-Industrialization

The decision to colonize North America was the seed of urbanization as administration, defense, and trade all required points of concentration and these subsequently grew into villages, towns, and finally into cities. By 1800 the prominent urban centers in British North America were Halifax, Quebec City, and Montreal. During the nineteenth century industry and transportation became increasingly important to the benefit of several centers in southern Ontario. The opening of the West afforded Montreal and Toronto the opportunity of becoming major industrial metropolises. During the post-1918 period they further consolidated their positions through their financial services.[107]

Obviously such developments required people and these were obtained through immigration and from the rural areas. However complex urban activities required a particular kind of training and education. Hence constant pressure was exerted upon urban and, to some extent, rural schools to provide such training and education. Indeed the major changes in Canadian education, with the exception of coeducational classes which were made necessary by the limited numbers of rural students, were all urban initiated. Such changes included the grading of instruction; extension of education beyond eight years to high or vocational schools; improvements in school design, teacher training, teaching methods, kindergartens, administration, and programs for the handicapped; and in basic curriculum changes. Wider selection of courses, both required and optional, and opportunities to specialize were stressed. Preparation for life was stressed in courses in manual arts, household science, bookkeeping and commercial subjects. The time required in order to offer these additional courses was obtained by reducing time spent on religious studies. In effect the schools were increasingly secularized.[108]

Urban life also affected the patterns of leisure. Indeed there were many who continued to follow traditional forms of amusement but the urban rich readily organized activities such as tennis and team sports while the poor turned to inexpensive unorganized activities. Increasingly leisure time was spent in amusements that had little reference to the home or church.[109]

The impressive commercial, industrial, and educational achievements of the cities were counterbalanced by slum conditions, overcrowding, poverty, crime and vice. As always the cities attracted those who would not or could not work and, as transportation improved, the boisterous mining and forestry workers during their off seasons. The cities were without effective means to meet these problems. Deviant behavior of all kinds was treated as crime, and punishment rather than rehabilitation was emphasized in efforts of control.[110] The cities were hampered in their search for solutions by a number of factors. Industrialization had created a working class which, while rarely radical, had different objectives than the employers.[111] Awareness of class differences expressed itself in the practice of the wealthy of locating their homes in exclusive districts. At the same time immigrants increasingly settled in neighborhoods according to national background or race.[112] However, despite the diversity and cleavages within the urban communities, in English Canada the moral standards of the middle and upper classes continued to exert great influence. In the main these had been evolved in earlier years in rural surroundings and placed great emphasis upon temperance and sabbatarianism.[113] In the early 1900's the "conservatives" were deploring urban conditions and were calling for a return to the "good old" standards while the "social reformers" were advocating government regulations and reforms to assist the deprived classes.[114]

Urbanization-industrialization had a strong impact upon the churches in English Canada. They were challenged to serve two greatly expanded and distinct groups: the socially marginal group consisting of criminals, prostitutes, drunkards, and the unemployable "drifters;" and the massive industrial labor class. The responses of the denominations and even within denominations were uneven, but, in terms of the ideological categories discussed earlier, totally understandable. The "conservatives" would do nothing that would result in radical change; the "sectarians" or "orgiastic chiliasts" despaired of any significant change in society but would seek to reach the individual with a message of "personal salvation;" and the "social reformer" would undertake to assist the individual through the reordering of society.

The mere existence of the problems suggested the inadequacy of existing church institutions, methods, and attitudes and the reformers began to press for changes. A significant but not too visible reform occurred with the introduction of sociology in the theological curricula of the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational churches. This will be discussed more fully in later chapters. As existing programs and methods of administration and finance at the local congregational level were found inadequate, the "institutional" church was introduced in problem areas. In some cases of these, denomination cooperation, usually Methodist and Presbyterian, was involved either in the pooling of resources or avoidance of competition. Institutional churches for non-Anglo-Saxons were opened in Victoria, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Port Arthur, Fort William, Sault Ste. Marie, Hamilton, Toronto, Montreal, and Sydney. For the most part these were administered by denominational home missions rather than social service departments. Many urban needs such as orphanages and homes for the aged were left to community and various levels of government. The notable exception was homes for "wayward and delinquent girls," or more accurately, unwed mothers. Such institutions were active in Sydney, Truro, Moncton, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, and Calgary. Again cooperation was high between the Methodists and Presbyterians throughout and in the Maritimes the Baptists and Anglicans also participated.[115] Changes were also wrought in the administration of the denominations. Generally this took the form of social reform committees which later became standing committees and finally permanent departments. The department level was reached by the Methodists in 1902, the Presbyterians in 1907, the Baptists in 1912 although this was reduced to the committee level in 1914, and the Anglicans in 1915. The Congregationalists never went beyond the committee level. All of these denominations were active in the Moral and Social Reform Council of Canada.[116] The ideological basis of the 1925 union has already been discussed, but it should be noted that interest in Union became apparent in 1902 and closely coincided with interest in reform work in the cities.

The question that remains, of course, is the effectiveness of the reform activities. One view,[117] based on the church-sect theme, is that the churches failed to meet the needs of the socially marginal and labor elements of society, the former turning to sect groups like the Salvation Army and the latter to unionism or unstructured social associations, because their needs "lay outside the province of interest of the churches." This is hardly supportable in view of the activities of the churches and the reforms that they, especially the Methodists, advocated. The situation of the socially marginal is better explained using the ideological categories, the "social reform" message of many of the churches was simply irrelevant to these people while the "orgiastic chiliast" message was not. Industrial labor was different. To be sure many workers found their way into the sect groups or the Labor Churches formed after 1918 but they were also found in other churches. However many had no religious connections. Ideologically they should have swarmed into the reform oriented churches or, if repelled by the presence of the middle and upper classes, into the Labor Churches. They did neither. Hence it follows that vast numbers of them had become secularized. In their search for association, leadership, and meaning, these people turned to unionism, another product of urbanization-industrialization.

Trade unions[118] were organizations of workers formed to protect their interests. Local craft unions had appeared in British North America in the early nineteenth century but it was not until 1873 that a national organization was created under the name of the Canadian Labor Union. This union lasted only four years and collapsed under the pressure of depression. However its practice of following British union precedents became accepted by Canadian labor during that period. The C.L.U. was succeeded by the Trades and Labor Congress in 1886. Its policy of admitting member unions composed only of labor served to narrow its membership somewhat but strengthened the sense of identity of its members. However, its policy of favoring international unions, adopted in 1902 and obviously a move toward a continental approach, created a split in labor in that the bodies rejected by the T.L.C. united to form the nationally oriented Canadian Federation of Labour. Efforts by radical western American unions to organize Canadian mining and railway workers proved unsuccessful although a decade later the International Workers of the World gained a small following among mining, railway, forestry, and unskilled workers. The radical approach later found expression in the 1919 One Big Union movement in Western Canada. Its approach to organization on a regional basis as well as its tactics of general strikes and sabotage and its objective of destroying the economic system were in fundamental opposition to both the T.L.C. and C.F.L. The legal and public response to the Winnipeg General Strike ended O.B.U. influence.[119] Hence labor in English Canada failed to find a basis of unity. It was divided in its desire to be national, continental, or international; in its organization by craft, industry, or region; in its choice of tactics; and in its objectives. The cleavage between English and French speaking labor on cultural grounds has already been noted. Trade unions did much for their members but their lack of cohesiveness prevented their becoming the creative force to rebuild Canadian society.

This, then, was Canada in 1925. At Confederation it had adopted the goals of territorial and economic expansion, bi-culturalism, and a continued association with Great Britain rather than becoming a field of American expansion. In the main these had been achieved but with flaws. Canada had expanded both to the west and north but Newfoundland remained outside of Confederation. A vast agricultural development had taken place in the West but with fearful hardship to the settlers, and an industrial complex had been developed in central Canada but at great cost to human dignity and in the secularization of national life. Both French and English cultures had survived but relations were strained and Quebec had become almost a cultural ghetto. Perhaps the most unqualified success had been in the maintenance of political independence from the United States and an association with Great Britain, and now the latter of these was about to change. In 1925 Canada was about to emerge from the colonial stage and take her place as an independent nation and a member of the British Commonwealth.

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER I

[1] S. I. Stuber, *How We Got Our Denominations, A Primer on Church History* (New York; 1959), pp. 88-93, 108-243.

[2] This is the basis of S. D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada* (Toronto, 1948); and a major theme in H. H. Walsh, *The Christian Church in Canada* (Toronto, 1956).

[3] H. R. Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York, 1951); *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (New York, 1957).

[4] K. Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia* (New York, 1936), pp. 211-247.

[5] D. H. Yoder, "Christian Unity in 19th Century America," *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, ed. R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 232-236.

[6] R. Rouse, "Voluntary Movements and the Changing Ecumenical Movement," *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, ed. R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 318-324.

[7] H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, p. 222.

[8] C. E. Silcox, *Church Union in Canada* (New York, 1933), pp. 85-88.

[9] K. S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York, 1953), pp. 1340-1341.

[10] J. H. Nichols, *History of Christianity, 1650-1950* (New York, 1956), pp. 256-257, 282, 410-413, 441. D. H. Yoder, *op. cit.*, pp. 256-259.

[11] P. Hughes, *A Popular History of the Catholic Church (1947)* (Garden City, 1954), pp. 204-205, 242-243. J. H. Nichols, *op. cit.* pp. 29-40, 204-205, 210-211, 214-216.

[12] S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 1-54. P. Sherrard, *The Greek East and the Latin West* (London, 1959), pp. 48-72. S. C. Neill, "Division and the Search for Unity Prior to the Reformation," *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, ed. R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 14-17. A. Schmemann, *The Historical Road of Eastern Orthodoxy* (Chicago, 1963), pp. 247-339.

[13] W. Walker, *A History of the Christian Church* (Edinburgh, 1918; revised 1959), pp. 301-340. J. H. Nichols, *op. cit.*, 135-162, 177-203, 241-258, 395. H. R. T. Brandeth, "Approaches of the Churches towards Each Other in the 19th Century," *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, ed. R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 263-268.

[14] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-77. K. S. Latourette, *op. cit.*, pp. 1031-1032, 1186-1187, 1267.

[15] J. H. Nichols, *op. cit.*, pp. 196, 281, 308, 436-440. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 242-243. D. H. Yoder, *op. cit.*, pp. 232-236. R. Rouse, *op. cit.*, pp. 328-329. K. S. Latourette, "Ecumenical Bearings of the Missionary Movement and the International Missionary Council," *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, ed. R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 255-268.

[16] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-76. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, p. 241. E. S. Gaustad, *A Religious History of America* (New York; 1966), pp. 165-167.

[17] C. H. Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915* (New Haven, 1940), pp. 280-317. J. H. Nichols, *op. cit.*, pp. 181-182, 196-198, 263-266, 281-282, 410-411, 440-442. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 166, 326-333. S. Crysdale, *The Industrial Struggle and Protestant Ethics in Canada* (Toronto, 1961), pp. 19-35. R. Rouse, *op. cit.*, pp. 327-328. N. Karlstrom, "Movements for International Friendship and Life and Work," *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, ed. R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 509-552.

[18] R. J. Cooke, *Religion in Russia under the Soviets* (New York, 1924), pp. 17-60. M. Spinka, *The Church and the Russian Revolution* (New York, 1927), pp. 1-101. L. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (London, 1944), pp. 7-22. N. Zernov, *Eastern Christendom* (London, 1961), pp. 197-207. E. Beng, *The Eastern Orthodox Church, Its Thought and Life* (Garden City, 1963), pp. 1-103, 138-161, 174-206. A Schmemann, *op. cit.*, pp. 292-341.

[19] E. E. Y. Hales, *Pio Nono* (London, 1956), pp. 146-149, 262-313. R. H. Schwandt, "The Life and Work of Leo XIII," pp. 15-51; G. Weigel, "Leo XIII and Contemporary Theology," pp. 213-226, *Leo XIII and the Modern World*, ed. E. T. Gargan (New York, 1961). P. Hughes, *op. cit.*, pp. 241-243, 255-271.

[20] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 484-495. A. Dru, *The Church in the Nineteenth Century: Germany 1800-1918* (London, 1963), pp. 17-33, 48-57.

[21] W. W. Sweet, *The Story of Religion in America* (New York, 1930), pp. 343-356, 407-410. C. H. Hopkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 215-232. J. H. Nichols, *op. cit.*, pp. 177-203, 255-282.

[22] A. Shortt, "The Winning of Responsible Government in Canada," *Queen's Quarterly*, X (1902-03), pp. 142-154.

[23] R. G. Trotter, "Why Confederation Came," *Queen's Quarterly*, XLV (1938-39), pp. 22-29. W. M. Whitelaw, "Reconstructing the Quebec Conference," *C.H.R.*, XIX (1938), pp. 123-137; *The Quebec Conference*, Historical Booklet No. 20, Canadian Historical Association, Ottawa, 1966. P. B. Waite, *The Charlottetown Conference*, The Canadian Historical Association, Ottawa, 1963. D. Creighton, *The Road to*

Confederation (Toronto, 1964). W. L. Morton, *The Critical Years: Union of British North America, 1857-1873* (Toronto, 1964).

[24] H. A. Innis, "Significant Factors in Canadian Economic Development," *C. H. Review*, XVIII (1937), pp. 379-381. D. Creighton, "Economic Nationalism and Confederation," *Canadian Historical Association Annual Report*, (1942), pp. 44-51. W. T. Easterbrook and H. G. J. Aitken, *Canadian Economic History* (Toronto, 1956), pp. 350-377. D. C. Masters, *Reciprocity, 1846-1911*, Historical Booklet No. 12 (Ottawa, 1965), pp. 3-11. D. C. Harvey, "The Maritime Provinces and Confederation," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1927), pp. 39-45. J. S. McKee, "Canada's Bid for the Traffic of the Middle West," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1940), pp. 26-35. J. Cooper, "The Political Ideas of George Eitenne Cartier," *C. H. Review*, XXIII (1942), pp. 286-294. D. C. Masters, *The Rise of Toronto: 1850-1890* (Toronto, 1947), pp. 56-73.

[25] C. P. Stacey, "The Fenian Troubles and Canadian Military Development, 1865-1971," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1935), pp. 26-35. J. P. Smith, "American Republican Leadership and the Movement for the Annexation of Canada in the Eighteen-Sixties," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1935), pp. 67-75. D. Creighton, "The United States and Canadian Confederation," *C. H. Review*, XXXIX (1958), pp. 209-222. C. P. Stacey, *The Undefended Border*, Historical Booklet No. 1 (Ottawa, 1962), pp. 3-11. C. P. Stacey, "British Military Policy in Canada in the Era of Confederation," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1934), pp. 20-29. J. A. Gibson, "The Colonial Office View of Canadian Federation, 1856-1868," *C. H. Review*, XXXV (1954), pp. 279-313.

[26] A. D. Lockhart, "The Contribution of Macdonald Conservatism to National Unity, 1854-1878," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1939), pp. 124-128. P. G. Cornell, "The Alignment of Political Groups in the United Province of Canada, 1854-1864," *C. H. Review*, XXX (1949), pp. 22-46. P. G. Cornell, *The Great Coalition*, Historical Booklet No. 19 (Ottawa, 1966). N. A. Belcourt, "French Canada under Confederation," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1927), pp. 29-32. M. Wade, *The French Canadians, 1760-1967* (Toronto, 1968), pp. 319-327. G. F. G. Stanley, "Act or Pact, Another Look at Confederation," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1956), pp. 1-25. P. B. Waite, "The Quebec Resolutions and Le Courrier du Canada, 1864-1865," *C. H. Review*, XL (1959), pp. 294-303. Jean-C. Bonenfant, *The French Canadians and the Birth of Confederation*, Historical Booklet No. 21 (Ottawa, 1966).

[27] W. P. M. Kennedy, "The Nature of Canadian Federalism," *C. H. Review*, II (1921), pp. 106-125.

[28] For biography see D. Creighton, *John A. Macdonald: The Young Politician*, 1952; and *John A. Macdonald: The Old Chieftan* (Toronto, 1955). J. M. Beck and D. J. Dooley, "Party Images in Canada," *Q.Q.*, LXVII (1960-61), pp. 433-434. J. M. Beck, *Pendulum of Power: Canada's Federal Elections* (Scarborough, 1968), pp. 1-23.

[29] For biography see D. C. Thomson, *Alexander Mackenzie: Clear Grit* (Toronto, 1960). J. A. Maxwell, "Lord Dufferin and the Difficulties with British Columbia, 1874-1877," *C. H. Review*, XII (1931), pp. 364-389. M. A. Ormsby, "Prime Minister Mackenzie, the Liberal Party, and the Bargain with British Columbia," *C. H. Review*, XXVI (1945), pp. 148-173. T. A. Burke, "Mackenzie and His Cabinet, 1873-1878," *C. H. Review*, XLI (1960), pp. 128-148. J. M. Beck, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-27.

[30] R. C. Brown, *Canada's National Policy: 1883-1900* (Princeton, 1964). J. M. Beck, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-68. P. B. Waite, "Sir John A. Macdonald, The Man," *Dalhousie Review*, XLVII (1967), pp. 143-158. F. W. Bissett, "Rt. Hon. Sir John Thompson," *Dalhousie Review*, XXV (1925), pp. 323-330. L. L. LaPierre, "Joseph Israel Tarte and the McGreevy-Langevin Scandal," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1961), pp. 42-57. B. Fraser, "The Political Career of Sir Hector Louis Langevin," *C. H. Review*, XLII (1961), pp. 93-132. L. C. Clark, "The Conservative Party in the 1890's," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1961), pp. 58-74.

[31] For a biography see J. W. Dafoe, *Laurier: A Study in Canadian Politics*, 1922, reprint Carleton Library No. 3 (Toronto, 1963); or J. Schull, *Laurier, The First Canadian* (Toronto, 1965). J. M. Beck, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-119. J. A. Colvin, "Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the British Preferential Tariff System," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, (1955), pp. 13-23. W. T. Easterbrook and H. G. J. Aitken, *op. cit.*, pp. 435-440, 477-485. F. W. Watt, "The Theme of Canada's Century, 1896-1920," *Dalhousie Review*, XXXVIII (1958), pp. 154-166. G. E. Foster, "Reciprocity with the United States," *University Magazine*, IX (1910), pp. 550-562. M. O. Hammond, "The Tragedy of Reciprocity," *Canadian Magazine*, XXXVIII (1911-1912), pp. 84-91. W. R. Riddell, "International Trade Relations and Reciprocity between and the United States," *Q. Q.*, XIX (1911-1912), pp. 330-339. L. E. Ellis, "Canada's Rejection of Reciprocity in 1911," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, (1939), pp. 99-111.

[32] For biography see R. G. Trotter, "Sir Robert Borden," *Q. Q.*, XLVI (1939-40), pp. 334-340; and H. Borden (ed.), *Robert Borden: His Memoirs*, 2 vols. (Toronto, 1938). R. Graham, *Arthur Meighen*, 3 vols. (Toronto, 1960). J. S. Brierly, "Union Government's Opportunities," *University Magazine*, XVII (1918), pp. 14-27. G. P. deT. Glazebrook, *A History of Transportation in Canada* (1938), reprint Carleton Library No. 12 (Toronto), pp. 147-181. D. C. Masters, *The Winnipeg General Strike* (Toronto, 1950). W. R. Graham, "Meighen and the Montreal Tycoons: Railway Policy and the Election of 1921," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, (1957), pp. 71-85. A. Balowyder, *The Winnipeg General Strike* (Toronto, 1967).

[33] L. G. Thomas, "The Liberal Party in Alberta, 1905-1921," *C. H. Review*, XXVIII (1947), pp. 411-427. W. L. Morton, *Manitoba* (Toronto, 1957), pp. 377-379. W. L. Morton, "The Western Progressive Movement," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1946), pp. 41-54. W. L. Morton, *The Progressive Party of Canada* (Toronto, 1950).

[34] For biography see R. M. Dawson, *William Lyon Mackenzie King: A Political Biography: 1874-1923* (Toronto, 1958). H. B. Neatby, *William Lyon Mackenzie King: The Lonely Heights: 1924-1932* (Toronto, 1963). H. A. Ferns and B. Ostry, *The Age of Mackenzie King* (London, 1955). F. A. McGregor, *The Rise and Fall of Mackenzie King, 1911-1919* (Toronto, 1962). H. A. Ferns and B. Ostry, "Mackenzie King and the First World War," *C. H. Review*, XXXVI (1955), pp. 93-112. J. Stevenson, "Sectionalism in Canada," *U. T. Q.*, V (1935-36), pp. 72-89. N. W. Sage, "Geographical and Cultural Aspects of the Five Canadas," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, (1937), pp. 28-34. J. M. Beck, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-175.

[35] C. Martin, "The First 'New Province' of the Dominion," *C. H. Review* I (1920), pp. 334-378; "Confederation and the West," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1927), pp. 20-28. G. F. G. Stanley, *The Birth of Western Canada* (Toronto, 1936, reprinted 1963), pp. 3-143. C. P. Stacey, "The Military Aspect of Canada's Winning of the West, 1870-1885," *C. H. Review*, XXI (1940), pp. 1-15. W. L. Morton, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-150.

[36] F. W. Howay, "British Columbia's Entry into Confederation," *C. H. A. Annual Review* (1927), pp. 67-73. H. L. Keenleyside, "British Columbia--Annexation or Confederation?" *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1928), pp. 34-40. W. N. Sage, "British Columbia Becomes Canadian," *Q. Q.*, LII (1945-46), pp. 168-175. M. A. Ormsby, "Canada and the New British Columbia," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1948), pp. 74-85. W. K. Lamb, "A Twig Bent in British Columbia History," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1948), pp. 86-92. F. H. Burns, "The Grand Collaboration: The Birth of British Columbia," *Q. Q.*, LXV (1958-59), pp. 195-208.

[37] J. A. Maxwell, "Prince Edward Island and Confederation," *Dalhousie Review*, XIII (1933), pp. 53-60. F. MacKinnon, "David Laird of Prince Edward Island," *Dalhousie Review*, XXVI (1946), pp. 405-411. F. MacKinnon, "Communications between P. E. I. and the Mainland," *Dalhousie Review*, XXIX (1949), pp. 182-183. F. W. P. Bolger, *Prince Edward Island and Confederation, 1863-1873* (Charlottetown, 1964).

[38] A. M. Fraser, "The Nineteenth Century Negotiations for Confederation of Newfoundland with Canada," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1949), pp. 14-21.

[39] H. Neatby, R. A. Preston, and M. Brunet, "Canadianism--A Symposium," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1956), pp. 74-76.

[40] For a history see M. Wade, *op. cit.*

[41] A. R. M. Lower, "In Unknown Quebec," *U. T. Q.*, VI (1936-37), pp. 88-91. A. L. Burt, "The Frontier in the History of New France," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1940), pp. 93-99. M. Barbeau, "French Canada: Its Survival," *Dalhousie Review*, (1931), pp. 433-438. E.

Turcotte and B. K. Sandwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-134. A. Maheux, "French Canadians and Democracy," *U. T. Q.*, XXVII (1957-58), pp. 341-348. Jean-M. Leger, "Aspects of French-Canadian Nationalism," *U. T. Q.*, XXVII (1957-58), pp. 311-316.

[42] C. Bilodeau, "Education in Quebec," *U. T. Q.*, XXVII (1957-58), pp. 398-402. C. B. Sissons, *Church and State in Canadian Education* (Toronto, 1959), pp. 129-137. C. E. Phillips, *The Development of Education in Canada* (Toronto, 1957), pp. 75-76, 134-135, 219-220, 285-286, 305-306, 307-309. E. Chartier, "The Classical College of Quebec," *Q. Q.*, XXXI (1923-24), pp. 270-288. M. Brunet, "Quebec's French-Speaking Universities and the Law of Double Imbalance," *Q.Q.*, LXXV (1968-69), pp. 616-622.

[43] H. T. Manning, *The Revolt of French Canada: 1800-1835* (Toronto, 1962). F. Ouellet, *Louis Joseph Papineau: A Divided Soul*, Historical Booklet No. 11 (Ottawa, 1961). M. Ayearst, "The Parti Rouge and the Clergy," *C. H. Review*, XV (1934), pp. 390-405.

[44] V. Cauchy, "Philosophy in French Canada: Its Past and Future," *Dalhousie Review*, XLVIII (1968), pp. 384-393. G. Lanctot, "Garneau, Fondateur de l'Histoire Scientifique en Canada," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1925), pp. 28-33. R. M. Saunders, "History and French Canadian Survival," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1943), pp. 25-33. M. Brunet, "The British Conquest: Canadian Social Scientists and the Fate of Canadians," *C. H. Review*, XL (1959), pp. 93-107. L. F. A. Upton, "In Search of Canadian History," *Q.Q.*, LXXIV (1966-67), pp. 674-682.

[45] J. K. Morchain and M. Wade, *Search for a Nation* (Toronto, 1967), p. 7.

[46] W. L. Morton, "The Extension of the Franchise to Canada," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1943), pp. 72-76. P. G. Cornell, "The Alignment of Political Groups in the United Province of Canada, 1854-1864," *C. H. Review*, XXX(1949), pp. 22-46.

[47] H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-110, 117-132, 134-148, 168-184. A. Wilson, *The Clergy Reserves of Upper Canada*, Historical Booklet No. 23 (Ottawa, 1969). D. W. L. Earl, ed., *The Family Compact: Aristocracy or Oligarchy?* (Toronto, 1967). J. Moir, "The Settlement of the Clergy Reserves," *C. H. Review*, XXXVII (1956), pp. 46-62.

[48] C. E. Phillips, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-74, 97-114, 118-120, 122-132, 198-200, 216-219, 223-224, 234-236, 245-246, 255-259, 265, 268, 304-306, 308-315, 323. A. Craick, "The Maritime Group of Universities," *Canadian Magazine*, XXXIX (1912), pp. 323-329. D. C. Harvey, "The Dalhousie Idea," *Dalhousie Review*, XVII (1937), pp. 131-143. D. C. Harvey, "The Early Struggles of Dalhousie," *Dalhousie Review*, XVII (1937), pp. 311-326. D. C. Harvey, "From College to University," *Dalhousie Review*, XVII (1937), pp. 411-431. D. C. Harvey, "Dalhousie University Established," *Dalhousie Review*, XVIII (1938), pp. 50-54. G. M. Rogers, "The Story of a Nova Scotia College," *Dalhousie Review*,

XVIII (1938), pp. 494-512. W. C. Keirstead, "The University of New Brunswick, Past and Present," *Dalhousie Review*, XXII (1942), pp. 345-347. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 152-166, 190-196. C. B. Sissons, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-58, 114-118, 132, 159, 219-220, 305-326, 362-364. R. S. Harris, "Higher Education in Canada," *Dalhousie Review*, XLII (1962), pp. 426-428. G. T. Rimmington, "The Founding of Universities in Nova Scotia," *Dalhouse Review*, XLVI (1966), pp. 319-324, 327-331.

[49] H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 202-206. A. R. M. Lower, *Canadians in the Making* (Don Mills; 1958), pp. 202-225. B. M. Corrigan, "Canadian Crusaders," *Q. Q.*, XLVII (1940-41), pp. 77-88. C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-87..

[50] M. Ayearst, *op. cit.*, pp. 370-405. H. Buller, *Quebec in Revolt: The Guibord Affair* (Toronto, 1965).

[51] G. F. G. Stanley, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-174. W. L. Morton, *Manitoba* (Toronto, 1957, 1967), pp. 94-175.

[52] J. S. Moir, ed., *The Cross in Canada* (Toronto, 1966), pp. 196-197.

[53] C. B. Sissons, *op. cit.*, pp. 229-249.

[54] G. F. G. Stanley, *Louis Riel*, Historical Booklet No. 2 (Ottawa, 1964). A. J. Silver and M. F. Valleur, *The North-West Rebellion* (Toronto, 1967). J. K. Morchain and M. Wade, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-145.

[55] F. Landon, "D'Alton McCarthy and the Politics of the Later 'Eighties," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1932), pp. 43-50.

[56] R. O. MacFarlane, "Manitoba Politics and Parties after Confederation," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1940), pp. 45-55. W. L. Morton, "Manitoba Schools and Canadian Nationality: 1890-1923," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1951), pp. 51-59. G. R. Cook, "Churches, Schools and Politics in Manitoba: 1903-1912," *C. H. Review*, XXXIX (1958), pp. 1-23. C. B. Sissons, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-96, 163-211, 253-294, 339-347. M. Prang, "Clerics, Politicians, and the Bilingual Schools Issue in Ontario, 1910-1917," *C. H. Review*, XLI (1960), pp. 281-307.

[57] W. T. Waugh, "The Development of Imperial Relations," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1927), pp. 82-83. A. C. Cooke, "Empire Unity and Colonial Nationalism, 1884-1911," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1939), pp. 77-86. H. B. Neatby, "Laurier and Imperialism," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1955), pp. 24-32. A. M. Willms, "Conscription, 1917: A Brief for the Defense," *C. H. Review*, XXXVII (1956), pp. 338-345. J. M. Beck, *op. cit.*, pp. 136-148. F. C. Underhay, "Sir Robert Borden and Imperial Relations," *Dalhousie Review*, X (1930), pp. 503-517. F. H. Soward, "Sir Robert Borden and Canada's External Policy, 1911-1920," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, (1941), pp. 65-82. J. W. Dafoe,

"Canada and the Peace Conference of 1919," *C. H. Review*, XXIV (1943), pp. 233-248. G. W. Carter, "Some Aspects of Canadian Foreign Policy after Versailles," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1943), pp. 94-103. J. A. Gibson, "Mr. Mackenzie King and Canadian Autonomy, 1921-1946," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, (1951), pp. 12-14.

[58] F. R. Scott, "The Privy Council and Minority Rights," *Q. Q.*, XLIV (1937), pp. 668-678.

[59] V. Cauchy, *op. cit.*, pp. 394-395. E. Chartier, *op. cit.*, pp. 270-288.

[60] E. Minville, "Economic and Social Tendencies of French Canada," *U. T. Q.*, XIX (1949-1950), pp. 148-149. W. E. Greening, "The Changing Labor Picture in French Canada," *Dalhousie Review*, XXXVI (1956), pp. 156-157. H. A. Logan, *Trade Unions in Canada* (Toronto, 1948), pp. 562-603.

[61] R. M. Saunders, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-34. L. F. S. Upton, *op. cit.*, pp. 680-682. V. Murdock, "The Abbe Groulx," *Q. Q.*, LXIII (1956), pp. 179-187.

[62] A. J. M. Smith, "Our Poets: A Sketch of Canadian Poetry in the Nineteenth Century," *U. T. Q.*, XII (1942-43), pp. 75-94. C. Bissell, "Literary Taste in Central Canada During the Late Nineteenth Century," *C. H. Review*, XXXI (1950), pp. 237-250. A. G. Bailey, "Literature and Nationalism after Confederation," *U. T. Q.*, XXV (1955-56), pp. 409-423.

[63] J. C. Webster, "Canadian Cultural Development," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1927), pp. 74-75.

[64] J. A. Irving, "One Hundred Years of Canadian Philosophy," *U. T. Q.*, XX (1950-51), pp. 107-115. J. A. Irving, "The Development of Philosophy in Central Canada from 1850 to 1900," *C. H. Review*, XXXI (1950), pp. 252-287. T. A. Goudge, "A Century of Philosophy in English-Speaking Canada," *Dalhousie Review*, XLVII (1967), pp. 537-543.

[65] F. A. Carman, "Our Archives and the National Spirit," *Canadian Magazine*, XI (1912-13), pp. 307-316. G. M. Wrong, "The Beginnings of Historical Criticism in Canada: A Retrospect, 1896-1936," *C. H. Review*, XVII (1936), pp. 1-8.

[66] W. L. Morton, "Clio in Canada: The Interpretation of Canadian History," *U. T. Q.*, XV (1945-46), pp. 227-234. J. M. Careless, "Frontierism, Metropolitanism, and Canadian History," *C. H. Review*, XXXV (1954), pp. 1-9. J. K. McConica, "Kingsford and Whiggery in Canadian History," *C. H. Review*, XL (1959), pp. 108-120.

[67] C. E. Phillips, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-189.

[68] R. A. Falconer, "The Tradition of Liberal Education in Canada," *C. H. Review,* VIII (1927), pp. 99-118. W. C. Murray, "University Development since Confederation," *Dalhousie Review,* VII (1927), pp. 479-486. C. B. Sissons, "University Federation at Toronto: A Canadian Experiment," *C. H. Review,* XXXI (1950), pp. 166-176. L. S. Harris, *op. cit.*, pp. 427-432.

[69] S. D. Clark, "Religious Organization and the Rise of the Canadian Nation," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1944), pp. 86-96. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 206-221.

[70] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-102. E. Schwarz, "Samuel Dwight Chown: An Architect of Canadian Church Union," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1961, pp. 37-42, 139-154.

[71] F. Yeigh, "The Biggest Business in Canada," *Canadian Magazine,* LIV (1919-20), pp. 283-293.

[72] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-72. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 210-217, 220-221.

[73] E. L. Morrow, *Church Union in Canada* (Toronto, 1923). E. Scott, *"Church Union" and the Presbyterian Church in Canada* (Montreal, 1928). S. D. Chown, *The Story of Church Union in Canada* (Toronto, 1930). C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-289. G. C. Pidgeon, *The United Church of Canada: The Story of Union* (Toronto, 1950). H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 288-303. E. Schwarz, *op. cit.*, pp. 162-246.

[74] S. D. Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 329-341.

[75] *Canadian Annual Review*, ed. J. C. Hopkins, "The Union Parliament: Hereditary Titles Discussion," XVIII (1918), pp. 563-566; "Titles in Canada: Government Policy and Parliamentary Action," XIX (1919), pp. 157-171. D. W. Thomson, "The Fate of Titles in Canada, *C. H. Review*, X (1929), pp. 236-246.

[76] J. M. S. Careless, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-21. D. C. Masters, *The Rise of Toronto, 1850-1890* (Toronto, 1947), Preface.

[77] G. G. Melvin, "Maritime Union," *University Magazine,* VIII (1909), pp. 436-442. W. S. Machutt, "Why Halifax was Founded," *Dalhousie Review,* XII (1932), pp. 524-532.

[78] J. E. Hodgett, "Our Early Peripatetic Government," *Q. Q.*, LIX (1951-52), pp. 316-322.

[79] H. A. Innis, *The Fur Trade in Canada* (Toronto:, 1930, reprinted 1967), pp. 9-280. M. Q. Innis, *An Economic History of Canada* (Toronto, 1935, reprinted 1948), pp. 5-14, 18-30, 34-52, 57-81, 89-120, 145-164, 182-190. D. Creighton, *The Empire of the St. Lawrence* (Toronto, 1956), pp. 1-385. W. T. Easterbrook and

H. G. J. Aitken, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-48, 74-90, 107-134, 150-153, 253-271, 293-301, 307-319.

[80] D. C. Masters, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-96.

[81] L. H. Clarke, "Putting a New Front on Toronto," *Canadian Magazine*, XLII (1913-14), pp. 213-214.

[82] C. L. Sibley, "Canada's Great National Port," *Canadian Magazine*, LX (1922-23), p. 128.

[83] W. N. Sage, "Vancouver, The Rise of a City," *Dalhousie Review*, XVII (1937), pp. 49-54.

[84] For application to Canada see W. N. Sage, "Some Aspects of the Frontier in Canadian History," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1928), pp. 62-72. A. L. Burt, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-99. For criticisms see J. C. McDougall, "The Frontier School and Canadian History," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1929), pp. 121-125. G. F. Stanley, "Western Canada and the Frontier Thesis," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1940), pp. 105-117. M. Zaslow, "The Frontier Hypothesis in Recent Historiography," *C. H. Review*, XXIX (1948), pp. 153-166. J. M. S. Careless, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-21.

[85] S. D. Clark, *The Developing Canadian Community* (Toronto, 1962), pp. 3-19.

[86] *Ibid.*, pp. 20-40, 59-60, 81-95.

[87] H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-34, 241-266. J. Maclean, *McDougall of Alberta* (Toronto, 1927), pp. 144-145. H. A. Kennedy, "Father Lacombe," *Builders of the West*, ed. F. W. Howay (Toronto, 1929), pp. 141-145.

[88] A. Shortt, "Life of the Settler in Western Canada Before the War of 1812," *Q. Q.*, XXII (1914-15), pp. 71-88. S. D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada* (Toronto, 1948), pp. 3-328. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-199. C. E. Phillips, *op. cit.* pp. 60-73, 98-114, 119-120. S. D. Clark, *The Developing Canadian Community*, pp. 41-80, 131-134, 137, 144, 179-180.

[89] L. H. Thomas, *The Struggle for Responsible Government in the North-west Territories, 1870-1897* (Toronto, 1956).

[90] G. Riddell, "A Cycle in the Development of the Canadian West," *C. H. Review*, XXI (1940), pp. 272-280. F. G. Roe, "Early Opinions on the 'Fertile Belt' of Western Canada," *C. H. Review* XXVII (1946), pp. 131-149. Anonymous, "The New Gospel of Land Settlement" and "Rejoinder," *University Magazine*, XVI (1917), pp. 110-118.

[91] J. S. Galbraith, "Land Policies of the Hudson's Bay Company, 1870-1913," *C. H. Review*, XXXII (1951), pp. 1-21.

[92] T. W. Grindley, "Wheat in the West," *Q. Q.*, XXXVII (1930-31), pp. 370-385.

[93] A. Fullerton, "Our Homesteaders," *Canadian Magazine*, XLVI (1915-16), pp. 249-258.

[94] R. G. Riddell, "A Cycle in the Development of the Canadian West," *C. H. Review*, XXI (1940), pp. 281-282.

[95] H. Mitchell, "The Grange in Canada," *Q. Q.*, XXII (1914-15), pp. 164-185. W. C. Clark, "The Country Elevator in the Canadian West," *Q. Q.*, XXIV (1916-17), pp. 46-68. W. A. Mackintosh, "The Canadian Wheat Pools," *Q. Q.*, XXXIII (1925-26), pp. 115-142.

[96] G. P. deT. Glazebrook, *op. cit.*, II. pp. 189-192.

[97] W. L. Morton, "Direct Legislation and the Origins of the Progressive Movement," *C. H. Review*, XXV (1944), pp. 279-288. W. L. Morton, "The Western Progressive Movement, 1919-1921," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1946), pp. 41-53.

[98] H. M. Morrison, "The Background of the Free Land Homestead Law of 1872," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1935), pp. 58-66. J. M. Gibbon, "The Foreign Born," *Q. Q.*, XXVII (1920-21), pp. 331-351. C. H. Young, *The Ukrainian Canadians, A Study in Assimilation* (Toronto, 1931), pp. 70-104. G. W. Simpson, "The Blending of Traditions in Western Canadian Settlement," *C. H. A. Annual Report* (1944), pp. 46-51.

[99] For an example of the attitude of the English-speaking to this issue see W. D. McBride, "What of the West," *University Magazine*, VIII (1909), pp. 281-283.

[100] C. E. Phillips, *op. cit.*, pp. 151-157. C. Martin, "The Completion of Confederation," *Q. Q.*, XXXVIII (1931-32), pp. 197-210. C. C. Lingard, "Economic Forces Behind the Demand for Provincial Status in the Old North-west Territories," *C. H. Review*, XXI (1940), pp. 254-267.

[101] C. B. Sissons, "Illiteracy in the West," *University Magazine*, XII (1913), pp. 440-447.

[102] E. A. Corbett, "Tory of Alberta," *Q. Q.*, LX (1952-53), p. 343.

[103] H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 283-285, 315-317,

[104] H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 264-280. S. D. Clark, *The Developing Canadian Community* (Toronto, 1962), pp. 108-109.

[105] S. D. Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 109, 122-123. W. E. Mann, *Sect, Cult, and Church in Alberta* (Toronto, 1955), pp. 9-26.

[106] J. C. Hopkins, "Canadian Life and Character," *University Magazine*, VIII (1909), pp. 293-304. J. G. Wales, "The Village and the Nation," *University Magazine*, VIII (1909), pp. 563-571. W. J. Brown, "The Farm Labor Problem," *University Magazine*, XII (1913), pp. 232-245. J. S. Woodsworth, "Nation Building," *University Magazine*, XVI (1917), pp. 85-89.

[107] D. C. Masters, *The Rise of Toronto: 1850-1890*. J. E. MacNab, "Toronto's Industrial Growth to 1891," *Ontario History*, XLVII (1955). S. D. Clark, *The Developing Canadian Community*, pp. 99-112.

[108] C. E. Phillips, *op. cit.*, pp. 191-210, 273-275, 431-444.

[109] A. R. M. Lower, *Canadians in the Making* (Don Mills, 1958), pp. 321-324.

[110] S. D. Clark, *The Developing Canadian Community*, pp. 99-105.

[111] M. Robin, "The Working Class and the Transition to Capitalist Democracy in Canada," *Dalhousie Review*, XLVII (1967), pp. 326-339.

[112] For a 1913 description of Toronto's immigrant communities see M. Bell, "Toronto's Melting Pot," *Canadian Magazine*, XII (1913), pp. 234-242.

[113] J. R. Burnet, "The Urban Community and Changing Moral Standards," *Urbanism and the Changing Canadian Society*, ed. S. D. Clark (Toronto, 1961), pp. 70-89.

[114] For examples see J. C. Hopkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 296-304. J. S. Woodsworth, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-88.

[115] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 233-234.

[116] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-92. S. Crysdale, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-26, 30.

[117] S. D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada*, pp. 368-424. S. D. Clark, *The Developing Canadian Community*, pp. 109-111.

[118] For a detailed history of Canadian unions see H. A. Logan, *op. cit.*

[119] "Labour: The Organized Workmen," *Canadian Annual Review*, ed. J. C. Hopkins, XIX (1919), pp. 447-495.

CHAPTER 2

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

In 1875 four denominations of the Calvinist theological tradition and practising the Presbyterian form of church government united to form the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Behind the event lay a long and heroic tradition of witness and work in the lands that became Canada in 1867.

The first attempt to introduce Calvinism had been short lived. By 1600 French Huguenots had established themselves in both New France and Acadia but following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 they were hounded into exile or conversion to Roman Catholicism. Only in what later became Nova Scotia did even traces of Huguenot influence survive. Under British rule Presbyterianism was reintroduced and flourished. Encouraged by the British authorities, settlers from Holland, Germany, and Switzerland made their way to Nova Scotia in 1749. Among them were many holding to the Reform or Calvinist faith. These "Presbyterians" were reinforced after the expulsion of the Acadians in 1755 by Presbyterians among the settlers from New England. This American element was later strengthened by Presbyterians among the United Empire Loyalists. Meanwhile immigration from the British Isles was adding to Presbyterianism in the Maritimes. As this last source continued and expanded during the next century, the continental European and American influences in Maritime Presbyterianism became subordinate to the British influence. Meanwhile, Presbyterianism had returned to the St. Lawrence region with the British forces at the time of the Conquest. It, too, was strengthened by Loyalists after 1783 but received its great impetus through immigration from the British Isles.[1]

British North American Presbyterianism was fragmented by reason of the different origins of its parts, by differences of opinion over local issues, and by imported quarrels. Of foremost importance among the imported quarrels was the Scottish Disruption of 1843. By an act of Parliament in 1707, Presbyterianism had been made the "established" church of Scotland and four years later "patronage" had been established by law. From time to time secessions occurred of both laity and clergy who felt the independence and spirituality of the church were compromised by the arrangement. However, a new situation arose in 1834 when the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland became dominated by people holding these views. Almost immediately the General Assembly passed an act forbidding the installation of a minister unless approved by a majority of the heads of families of the congregation involved. In effect the congregations were given a veto over the nomination of ministers by patrons. In a series of court cases the rights of the patrons were upheld and an appeal to the House of Lords was decided in their favour in 1843. Thereupon over one-third of the ministers (451 of 1,023) withdrew from the Church of Scotland and with sympathizing laymen constituted the "Free Church of Scotland." Patronage was indeed the immediate issue but other factors such as class and ideology were also involved. Those who remained with the Church of Scotland or "Kirk" tended to be conservative in attitude and included many of the upper class; those who formed the "Free Church" were more evangelical and reform oriented. Moreover the latter, in their resentment toward the courts and the House of Lords, also had a nationalistic quality.[2]

Representatives from both groups were soon busily soliciting support among the "Kirk" Presbyterians in British North America and the issue was presented at the various synod meetings in 1844. Patronage was not practiced in America and so was not an issue. However the synods divided on an ideological basis. The new North American "Kirk" soon found itself in difficulty as scores of its more capable men moved to Scotland to fill the pulpits vacated by the ministers who had gone to the "Free Church."[3]

By 1850 there were three basic positions held by the various bodies of British North American Presbyterianism but within these there were divisions which generally corresponded to the political boundaries. In addition to the synods in connection with the "Kirk" and "Free Church" of Scotland, there were others with no external connections which were termed "Independent." Some of these had never had such connections; others had cut their ties with parent churches in the United States. During the 1860's a series of unions involving the "Free Church" and various "Independent" synods and presbyteries vastly reduced the "Independent" element. During the same period the "Kirk" synods of the Maritimes were united so that in 1870 Canadian Presbyterianism consisted of four main parts: a "Kirk" synod in both the Maritimes and in the St. Lawrence region, and a "Free Church" in each of the areas; plus a tiny scattering of "Independent" bodies.[4]

The 1871 census listed Presbyterianism as the second largest denomination in the five "eastern provinces" exceeded only by Roman Catholicism and followed closely by Methodism and Anglicanism (Roman Catholics, 1,532,784; Presbyterians, 574,277; Methodists, 560,457; and Church of England, 501,269). The Baptists were next with less than one-half the Anglican numbers. Within Presbyterianism the "Free Church" outnumbered the "Kirk" by approximately three to one and the "Independent" numbers were negligible.[5]

While the "Kirk" still tended to be "conservative" and the "Free Church" more reform and evangelical, there was growing interest during the 1860's in the possibility of a general union of Canadian Presbyterianism. By 1871 a proposed basis of union had been prepared. After examination and amendment by the church courts and passage by the provincial legislatures, the union was accepted effective June 15, 1875.[6]

Naturally there were some congregations and ministers who did not join the union. Those in central Canada tended to be "chiliast" or extremely sectarian in character, while those in the Maritimes were more often "conservative." Both were forced into an "independent" posture. Most Presbyterians in British Columbia were associated with Scottish missionary churches and did not join the union in 1875, but like the dissenting elements in the east, joined piecemeal until, by 1925, Presbyterianism in Canada was, for all practical purposes, unified.[7]

The churches entering the union of 1875 collectively claimed 623 ministers and 90,599 communicants (the "Free Church in central Canada, 328 and 50,702 and in the Maritimes, 124 and 18,028;

the "Kirk" in central Canada, 141 and 17,247, and in the Maritimes, 30 and 4,622).[8] One year after the union the Presbyterian Church in Canada recorded 579 ministers and 88,228 communicants.[9] Such shrinkage was not uncharacteristic of other unions.

The United Presbyterian Church was active in all the provinces and in the Northwest Territories. However its work west of Ontario was relatively new and weak. Work in Manitoba dated back to 1851 and only recently had been organized as a presbytery. The scanty activity in the Territories was conducted as a Home Mission, while that in British Columbia, dating from 1862, was conducted as a Foreign Mission.[10] Mission work was also in progress in the New Hebrides, Trinidad, Formosa, and India. During the next half century this would be extended to China, Korea, and British Guiana.[11]

Before turning to the factors prompting the 1875 Union, attention should be given to the trends in Presbyterianism in the British Isles and in the United States. In Scotland a series of unions had occurred among the secessionist bodies in 1820, 1827, 1847, and 1852, and a secessionist group had rejoined the Kirk in 1839. This reduced the number of secessionist and free churches but there were still several, and an enormous gulf separated them from the Kirk.[12] In contrast, the fragmented condition of American Presbyterianism stemming from its variety of origins and attitudes toward local issues had been further increased by new divisions over slavery and the Civil War, and by the post-Civil War emergence of Negro churches.[13] In the matter of union the Canadians were leagues in advance but their circumstances were significantly different. In Scotland there was less sense of urgency and the patronage issue lived on. The Americans had no patronage problem and with the Canadians shared the sense of urgency regarding the missionizing of a western frontier, but the scars of the Civil War were deep and the racial problem still existed.

The 1875 union of Canadian Presbyterianism was primarily motivated by the desire to form an institution capable of serving the needs of the vastly expanded nation. This involved continued and expanded service to the avowedly Presbyterian population and expanded outreach or mission to those parts of the population which the Presbyterians considered neglected because of geographic or social factors. The foundations for the mission work had been laid by the parties to the union. Mission work had been undertaken among the agricultural settlers, fishermen, loggers, and Indians, all of whom lived in isolated circumstances. Missions were also conducted among two specific groups in more settled areas. Religious and educational activities were carried on among the French-Canadians; indeed a program of theological studies in the French language was offered by Presbyterian College, Montreal, more of which will be said later. Work among the negroes of the Buxton Settlement in Kent County had begun in 1848 to assist freed and escaped American slaves, and continued long past the Civil War.[14]

The second factor promoting the 1875 union was the desire to crusade against Roman Catholicism. Earlier manifestations of this were the promotion of rallies featuring anti-Roman Catholic speakers, foremost among whom was C. Chiniquy,[15] and constant sniping at the Roman Catholic church in the Presbyterian press. The Presbyterian press described the 1875 union as the merging of

Leaf 62 omitted in page numbering

"four armies."[16] A year after the union, the *Presbyterian Year Book and Almanac for the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland* was issued containing a description of the consummation of the Union in which it was observed that

> thus did four Presbyterian Churches become one in the Dominion of Canada, where, only ninety years ago, there was in existence only one small Presbytery of some four ministers; its first General Assembly being held in a Province (Quebec) whose Popery is the dominant religion, and in a city (Montreal) where its chief strength lies, the Union also taking place at a time very critical in the History of the Dominion, when in the councils of Rome, a resolution has been registered, which is being persistently pursued, to win Canada back again to the Latin Cross.[17]

These then were the main forces motivating the Union of 1875, an open and positive desire to minister to the religious needs of the nation and a less attractive but powerful desire to crusade against Roman Catholicism.

In 1925 the Presbyterian Church in Canada, after a half century long experience as a "nationwide" church, would enter a still larger union. In examining certain policies of the Presbyterian Church during this period, the time span will be broken into two parts of thirty-five and fifteen years respectively. So different were the conditions and problems of the latter period that several basic policies and practices of the Presbyterians experienced change.

1. PRESBYTERIAN POLICIES (1875 - 1910)

In 1875 the Presbyterian Church in Canada consciously assumed a task far greater than the collective tasks of the parties to the Union. Of crucial importance to its success would be the ministry.

The ministry, of course, was the product of the theological colleges but these were highly influenced by the expectations of the church and its ministers. Therefore it is necessary to consider the ministry before turning to the colleges.

The Ministry

The ministry of the Presbyterian Church in Canada was initially composed of the collective ministries of the uniting bodies. Naturally provision had to be made for its perpetuation and expansion. This took two directions--measures to permit the entry of ministers from other denominations, and provision for the training and ordination of new ministers.

Regarding the former, the General Assembly of 1875 decreed that

> This Church shall, under such terms and regulations as may from time to time be agreed on, receive Ministers and Probationers from other Churches, and especially from Churches holding the same doctrine, government, and discipline as itself.[18]

The results of this were far reaching. Although the records for the period are incomplete and often imprecise, several important facts do emerge.[19] In the period 1875-1910 slightly over four hundred ministers of other churches applied to enter the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. The records indicate the denominational background of some three hundred of these. Over one-half of these (about 180) were from Presbyterian churches, and of these almost two-thirds (about 115) were from the United States and almost one-third (about 50) were from Scotland. The second largest group (about 60) were from Congregationalism of which the majority were Canadian (about 45). The third largest group were Methodists (about 30), of which the majority were also Canadian (about 25), and the last sizable group were Baptists (about 20), again largely Canadian (about 15). Little if any further education was required for any of these men, indicating that Canadian Presbyterian standards were not significantly different in degree or quality from those of the churches from whence these men came. In general these men reinforced the English speaking character of the church, its North American quality, and its tendency to evangelicalism.

As to setting standards and providing for the training of ministers, the parties to the 1875 Union had ~~a~~ remarkably common view. The "ministry" was among several matters referred to a "Committee to Mature Measures for Next Assembly" under the heading of "Ecclesiastical Procedures."[20] Their report was to be subject to the "Barrier Act," an old Presbyterian device adopted by the 1875 Union by which contentious issues to be decided by the General Assembly were "remitted" or referred to the presbyteries for consideration. In this way hasty legislation was avoided and the General Assembly could base its decisions on a wide measure of opinion. As the report was not available for the 1876 General Assembly, it was ordered that the old ordination and induction services of the various synods be used until the report was prepared and adopted.[21] When the report failed to materialize for the 1877 and 1878 General Assemblies, a smaller committee was appointed and its recommendations were authorized for publication as "a useful guide to the office bearers of the church."[22] It should be noted at this point that such a general unanimity of views existed that church policy, in "useful guide" if not in definitive form, could be entrusted to a committee; second, that in the matter of the ministry, the committee's position was so satisfactory that it was retained for the remainder of the period under discussion and never was sent to the Presbyteries; and finally, that in the absence of a "definitive" statement of the ministry, change was possible without conflict with a rigid position.

The committee report of 1879 which contained the new "Questions" for use in ordination and induction naturally avoided anything that would appear to favour either side in the old "Kirk"-"Free Church" controversy. On the other hand there was a new emphasis on Scripture in the "Questions" that were to be posed to each new ordinand. The Scriptures, from being the "only rule of faith and manners," became "the only infallible rule of faith and manners." This new emphasis was a product of controversy. In every denomination there is a tendency for custom or creed to acquire an aura of sacredness among the membership, for example, the status of the Papacy in Roman Catholicism, the Lambeth Quadrilateral among Anglicans, and the Westminster Catechism among Presbyterians. The Union of 1875 was not four months old when D. J. Macdonnell, minister of St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, created an uproar through pulpit comments that appeared to conflict with the literal meaning of the Westminster Confession. Macdonnell's defense was that his views, like Calvin's, were based upon Scripture. The presbytery decided in his favour and the precedent was firmly established that in doctrinal disputes the Scripture would have primacy over the Confession.[23] The phraseology of the new Questions not only reflected this position but drew support from anti-Roman Catholic feelings. It had been but a short time since many Presbyterians had been deeply offended by the Roman Catholic claims that Papal pronouncements on "faith and morals" were "infallible." In the larger view the new emphasis in the Questions paved the way for the introduction of the new Biblical and scientific scholarship into both the Presbyterian colleges and congregations.[24] To be sure, there was unevenness in both the spread and the acceptance of the new thought, but Canadian Presbyterianism was spared turmoil such as that experienced by Scottish Presbyterianism over the 1881 heresy trial of W. R. Smith of Free Church College, Aberdeen, and by American Presbyterianism over the trials of C. A. Briggs of Union Theological Seminary and H. P. Smith of Lane Seminary, in the early 1890's.[25]

The "Questions" of 1879 outlined, in part, the Presbyterian requirements for the ministry. In answering the "Questions," a candidate affirmed his acceptance of the Old and New Testaments as "the only infallible rule of faith and manners," the Westminster Confession as the creedal statement of the church, and the polity and worship practices of Presbyterianism as being "pure" and "in accordance with Scripture." Further, obedience to the courts of the church was promised, a religious motive for entering the ministry was attested to, and the candidate promised "to live a holy and circumspect life, to rule well . . . [his] own house, and faithfully and diligently discharge all the duties of the ministry to the edification of the body of Christ." Prior to all this, of course, the candidate had fulfilled a high academic requirement. Before turning to the educational policies, it should be noted that the Presbyterians considered all ministers as equal and, apart from such obvious exceptions as the professorial positions, interchangeable in regard to appointment.

The Colleges

Before considering the educational policies of the Presbyterians, an overview of the colleges which entered the Union will be given, first those which entered as "Kirk" colleges.

Queen's College was inspired by the concern of Upper Canada Presbyterians during the 1830's to provide higher educational opportunities for their young people, the youth of the wider community, and especially for young men desiring to enter the ministry. A constituency seemed assured as the opening of King's in Toronto and McGill in Montreal seemed endlessly delayed and, besides, the former would be Anglican and the latter "godless." The Methodist college in Cobourg was regarded as too fanatic. The American Presbyterian colleges were considered too new, too weak, or too republican. The Scottish Presbyterian colleges were considered ideal but the cost was beyond the means of most families.

In 1838 a committee of the Toronto presbytery presented a report containing an analysis of the situation which subsequently proved to be the prototype for arguments in favour of opening new colleges.

> Ministers educated from amongst our own Provincial youths would have no drawback in their usefulness; and they would have a more palpable advantage in the physical training, which would

> prepare them for the hardships incident to Missionary and Ministerial service in Canada.
>
> Secondly-- . . . there are now, in some congregations, individuals desiring of entering into the Ministry, and to demand of such an Education in a Scottish University, would be a virtual barring of the door to their admission. . . . The Church with a Ministry purely Scottish, cannot acquire a Provincial character, and neither can it grow with the growth of the community. . . . The sooner that the converts of a country can be trained for the Ministry, the sooner may its evangelization be expected.
>
> Thirdly-- . . . The supply of preachers from Scotland has hitherto been very scanty . . . [and] has actually been diminishing. . . .
>
> Fourthly--The importance of commencing early . . . may be urged. . . . Let us lay a large and deep foundation-- . . . capable of extension, and build on it a superstructure suitable to our present wants and means: and it may be left to another generation to complete it. . . .
>
> No ecclesiastical body, except our Church, and none of the secular professions in the Province, exact of those admitted into them an education in a British University. . . .[26]

According to procedure the report was remitted to the presbyteries and the favourable response resulted in the decision by the Synod in 1839 to proceed with the college proposal. Kingston was chosen as the site and a commission was ordered to obtain a charter from the legislature and to begin the collection of funds.[27] Meanwhile negotiations begun in 1833 toward a union of the United Presbyterian Synod of Upper Canada and the "Kirk" ended in 1840 in a union.[28] This brought a welcome addition of support. In 1841 a college charter was obtained and, as customary in "Kirk" colleges, power to appoint faculty was vested in the Board of Governors.

The college opened in 1842 with a faculty recruited in Scotland. When the "Disruption" occurred two years later, Queen's remained with the "Kirk." The college immediately experienced difficulties as many of the stronger financial supporters, like the majority of the theological students, became "Free Church." As the college floundered, good leadership became difficult to obtain and Queen's suffered through two decades of frequent changes of principals. Queen's appeared destined to become, at best, a parochial institution of interest only to Upper Canadian Presbyterians. During the 1850's efforts were made to broaden its role and increase its support.

> There are many reasons why the Ministers, Members, adherents, and friends generally, of our Presbyterian Church in Canada and in the Lower Provinces should cordially and cheerfully do all that in them lies to sustain, invigorate, and extend the interests and influence of Queen's College. . . . Queen's College is not only our own but that it is, moreover, the only Academical Institution in the Colonial Empire of Britain, connected with the Church of Scotland, (if we except the Missionary Establishments of our India Scheme) where a thorough course of preparation for the Pastorate and ministerial duties can be secured, surely every affectionate, willing hearted, right minded friend and member of our Church will rejoice that we are astir in the great business, and that an opportunity is now presented for liberal donations. . . .[29]

However the attraction of the Scottish universities and reliance upon their graduates remained too strong and Queen's languished until 1864 when W. Snodgrass began his thirteen year reign as principal. Under his leadership, Queen's added law and medicine to its course offerings of arts and theology. By 1875 suitable buildings had been acquired and a substantial endowment had been subscribed. The latter was essential to replace the support formerly received from the Church of Scotland.[30]

The second "Kirk" college was Morrin College in Quebec City. In 1860 a trust was established by Dr. J. Morrin, a successful physician of Scottish birth, for a college which was to offer instruction in the "higher branches of learning," especially theology. The college was incorporated in 1861 and opened in 1862 using rented facilities. Morrin had died in 1861 and the college was opened under his name. By 1865 the college's Divinity program was recognized by the Church of Scotland while the faculties of Arts and Law had become affiliated with those of McGill.[31] The college moved from rented quarters to its own building in 1870. While the number of theological students was never large, rarely exceeding ten, the college did offer higher educational opportunity to English speaking students in Quebec City and was surprisingly progressive in opening its doors to female students and in offering an evening program of studies to part-time students.[32]

Educational schemes were not always well received in "Kirk" circles. The "Kirk" in the Maritimes from the beginning assisted candidates for the ministry to attend university in Scotland through a "Young Men's Scheme." However, the results in terms of numbers or quality had not been satisfactory. When G. M. Grant, himself a product of the "Scheme" and later principal of Queen's, proposed in 1865 that a college be opened to replace the "Scheme," the uproar in the Synod was so severe that further discussion of a college was forbidden.[33]

Finally, the "Kirk" participated in a cooperative college venture with the "Free Church" in Manitoba in 1872. However, as the college was mainly "Free Church," discussion of it will be deferred.

Of the "Free Church" colleges that entered the Union, Halifax claimed the earliest origins. It began in 1820 as part of Pictou Academy. The Academy had been opened in 1806 by the Presbyterians in response to their exclusion from King's College.

While the Academy remained in Pictou, the theology department moved from place to place to accommodate its successive principals who also had pastoral responsibilities. Hence it was at Pictou until 1838, Halifax from 1838 to 1843, Malpeque in Prince Edward Island until 1848, West River until 1858, and then in Truro until 1860. While in Truro it acquired buildings and was organized formally into faculties of Arts and Theology. Meanwhile the "Free Church," organized after the Disruption, had opened a college in Halifax in 1848. In 1860 the parent synods of the colleges united and the colleges were consolidated in Halifax, using the "Free Church" facilities. In 1865 the faculty joined the staff of Dalhousie University. The union of 1875 made possible the gathering of a substantial endowment fund and a move to new quarters at Pine Hill.[34] Reference has been made to the evangelical spirit and reform attitude of the "Free Church." Such, of course, was reflected in the colleges. In the Halifax college it found expression in interest in foreign missions. On the centenary of the college in 1920 it would be noted that of 530 graduates in theology, 43 had entered foreign mission service.[35]

Knox College, Toronto, was founded in 1844 to serve the students who had left Queen's over the Disruption and was incorporated in 1858. The 1861 union of the "Free Presbyterian Church" and the "United Presbyterian Church in Canada in connection with the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland," an older secessionist body, brought the slender resources and student body of its "Divinity Hall" to Knox College.[36] From its beginning Knox College made rapid progress. It was frequently forced to seek larger accommodation and as early as 1854 was able to dispense with the assistance hitherto received from the Free Church of Scotland. In 1874 construction of permanent facilities was undertaken and these were occupied in 1875.[37] The evangelical spirit of Knox College students was reflected in the strong support given to a variety of missionary projects and in participation in work among the destitute. Significant numbers of the graduates entered foreign and home mission service.[38]

Presbyterian College, Montreal, was first proposed by J. W. Dawson, principal of McGill, and J. Redpath, a prominent businessman, both of that city. The proposal was considered by the presbytery in 1864, was quickly remitted to the presbyteries and approved, a charter of incorporation was obtained, and the collection of an endowment fund was undertaken. In 1867 the Synod made several important recommendations: the faculty was to be kept small and no immediate building was to be undertaken, endowment funds were to be gathered only within the presbyteries of Montreal, Brockville, and Ottawa (this territorial principle should be noted, for it will be of great importance later), and the college was to begin work at once.[39] The college opened in 1867 in "borrowed" quarters and with faculty "borrowed" from congregations for three month terms. The following year the college obtained a permanent faculty. Affiliation with McGill enabled students to benefit from its facilities and course offerings. In 1869 the Synod empowered the college to employ D. Cousoirat for the purpose of offering a theological course of studies to French-speaking students, the cost to be a first charge on the French-Canadian Missionary Society of the Canada Presbyterian Church.[40] Mission activity among the students was directed toward the French-Canadian Roman Catholic community. However as the French Canadians increasingly identified Roman Catholicism with their struggle for cultural survival, this activity, like the theological program in French, found less and less acceptance until they were both quietly discontinued. In 1873 the college moved to its own permanent buildings.[41]

Finally, there was Manitoba College. The early college proposals of the Rev. J. Black, who had begun mission work in Red River in 1851, went unheeded until 1870 when the Presbytery of Manitoba was formed and the rest of the work in the Territories was transferred from the Foreign to the Home Missions Committee. The Manitoba Presbytery immediately addressed its attention to the founding of a college. The "Kirk" press took notice,

> We rejoice to see that a Presbytery, albeit it is of the other branch of the Church, has been formed in Manitoba, and has already taken steps to establish a College. It is to our shame as the elder branch of the Church that Presbyterianism is so weak there.[42]

These "steps" included formation of a provisional board, the collection of funds, and appointment of a professor. The college opened in 1871 in rented quarters but the following year a log building was constructed in Kildonan and the faculty was expanded by a part-time member from the "Kirk." The 1873 General Assembly ordered the removal of the college to Winnipeg and the expansion of the curriculum to "General Arts and Science, and Commerce." Theology was to be added when "convenient;" this later proved to be in 1883. Construction of frame college buildings was in progress when union occurred. During the three years of joint participation, the annual contribution of the "Free Church" was approximately $4,000, and that of the "Kirk" was $2,000.[43]

While the variety of circumstances of the colleges make it difficult to generalize on the "Kirk" and "Free Church" educational policies, some trends are evident. The "Kirk" was more reliant upon Scotland for its supply of ministers and training facilities. To be sure, Queen's was opened to educate a native ministry but that was before the Disruption removed many of its most active supporters. Later the "Kirk" positively refused to even consider a Maritime college. Morrin College was primarily the product of one person's interest and concern. In contrast, the "Free Church" was dedicated to the growth of a native born and trained ministry. The "Kirk" college curricula tended to include both general and theological programs, in part made necessary because of their locations. The "Free Church" also offered general programs when necessary, but readily withdrew to concentrate on theology when arrangements could be made with neighboring institutions. The colleges naturally reflected the ideologies of their parent churches; the "Kirk" colleges being conservative and the "Free Church" colleges being more evangelical and reform oriented. To give but one example, Morrin College in Quebec City sought only to serve English-speaking students whereas Presbyterian College, Montreal, made a special effort to serve the French-speaking community. Administratively the "Kirk" colleges were dominated by their Boards of Governors; the "Free Church" colleges were more directly under Synod direction. So basic was this last point that the colleges entered the 1875

Union on the understanding that their relationship to the new church would be

> . . . similar to those which they now hold to their respective churches, and to preserve their corporate existence, government and functions, on terms and conditions like to those under which they now exist. . . .[44]

However, it was recognized that some changes would be necessary. Therefore "Colleges, education for the Ministry, [and] examination of students" were among those matters referred to the "Committee to Mature Measures for Next Assembly."[45] The findings of this and other later similar committees must be examined for they contain the official policy of the Presbyterian Church toward its colleges.

Financial support for the colleges was a problem throughout the period of this study and it was particularly severe at the time of the Union because of the general economic depression which Canada was experiencing. The 1876 General Assembly approved the committee recommendation that the "territorial" principle of the "Free Church" be retained and expanded to include the formerly "Kirk" colleges. The Halifax college would draw its support from the Maritimes, the colleges in Quebec City and Montreal from the region between the Maritimes and the Ottawa Railway, and the colleges in Kingston, Toronto, and Winnipeg from the area west of the Ottawa Railway.[46] However it was soon evident that annual appeals on a territorial basis were too subject to local economic conditions and changing attitudes, and the system required repeated appeals to the people. Therefore the General Assembly turned to a policy of encouraging endowment funds. In 1877, 1878, and 1881 such appeals were made but still on the territorial principle.[47] However, the territorial principle was now under question. The 1878 request for a common fund for the Montreal, Kingston, and Toronto colleges had been refused but by 1879 the Toronto college was in such serious financial difficulty that a committee was struck to study the whole question of college finance.[48] Its recommendation that a common fund be tried on a limited basis was accepted by the 1881 General Assembly and proved so successful by 1886 that the General Assembly instituted a General Fund for all the colleges as well as continuing to support the building of individual college endowment funds.[49] This twofold approach had several good features. Endowment funds removed some of the uncertainties of annual appeals yet offered scope for local loyalties; the annual appeal for the General Fund served to raise funds and regularly drew the attention of the Church to the needs of the colleges. Moreover by not fixing the basis of division of the General Fund, flexibility in its use was preserved but this had the unfortunate effect of tempting individual colleges to pressure for special consideration.

Two of the colleges, Morrin and Queen's, found these policies inadequate. Both were former "Kirk" colleges and were committed to broad curricula. As will be seen later, Morrin was forced to close by 1900. Under the leadership of G. M. Grant, Queen's sought the role of being the university center of eastern Ontario with state subsidization. By 1900 Grant recognized the impossibility of this so long as the Board of Governors was totally Presbyterian and the theological courses were offered as seminary rather than university courses. He was gradually gaining support in the General Assembly for change in both areas when he died in 1902. His plan died with him and Queen's went on as before to the end of the period.[50]

The broad problems of student recruitment and theological education, referred by the General Assembly of 1875 to the Committee to Mature Measures for Next Assembly, were finally reported upon in 1879 and the recommendations were approved by the General Assembly. The report, consisting of sixteen sections, falls naturally into the four sections of student recruitment, student supervision, preparatory education, and theological education.[51]

The recruitment of student ministers remained the responsibility of first, the home, and second, the sessions of the congregations and the presbyteries. Supervision of the students prior to entering college and during the vacations of the college years was delegated to the individual students' home presbytery. During the college term it passed to the church with which the student chose to associate. The arrangement reflected the fact that the majority of students at that time came from rural or near-rural backgrounds while the colleges were in urban settings.

Preparatory educational requirements for theological study were either a degree in Arts from a recognized university or an alternative course set by the church. The latter consisted of preliminary examinations in Latin, Greek, English, Mathematics, Geography, and English History, followed by three years of college courses in Latin, Greek, English, Hebrew, Mathematics, History, Philosophy and Science. No exceptions were permitted apart from General Assembly approval and all students were required to have a knowledge of Greek and Hebrew.

The theological program was to consist of three terms, each of six months duration. The courses were to consist of "Apologetics" (the intellectual defense of Christianity), "Systematic Theology" (a thorough examination of Christian ideas), "Exegetics" (the techniques of deriving the meaning of Scripture; such studies used the Greek and Hebrew texts), "Biblical Criticism" (the study of Scripture as literature), "Church History" (the study of the history of the Church usually beginning with the work of Paul of Tarsus), "Homiletics" (the techniques of sermon preparation and preaching), and "Pastoral Theology" (the application of theology to the work of a pastor, but in practice frequently used as an opportunity to give instruction in important practical matters neglected elsewhere). While the committee could not impose uniformity among the colleges, it did recommend that Church History, Systematic Theology, and Exegetics be studied in each of the three terms, Apologetics during two terms, and the other subjects during one term. Further, all students were required to prepare several papers during their college years. Examinations were the responsibility of the Senate or Board of each college and reports of each student's work, attendance, and conduct were to be submitted to his home presbytery and to the General Assembly. The recommended curriculum was impressive in two regards. Despite the relatively undeveloped character of Canada and the newness of the colleges, the standards were surprisingly high. Second, because of the continuing contact with the Scottish churches, the program contained courses such as Biblical Criticism which, at the time, were very "up to date."

The theology program itself remained unchanged until 1910. Efforts by the senate of Knox College in 1887 to have medical studies added to the program met with no success nor were they accepted as a substitute for the preparatory degree for men intending to serve Canadian or foreign mission fields.[52] Knox was, of course, a former "Free Church" college with missions interests primarily toward the destitute and the West, both types of work which would be facilitated if the missionaries had a second and needed skill. The center of opposition was Presbyterian College, Montreal, also a former "Free Church" institution but under the influence of a more conservative element of society and with mission interest directed to the French Canadian Roman Catholic community. As such it regarded the proposed change as an unreasonable burden for marginal benefits. In contrast, the preparatory program experienced searching review and later change. In 1880 the Ottawa Presbytery requested the General Assembly to make the degree B.A. mandatory for entrance to theological studies. The question was referred to the colleges and, as often happened when opinion was sharply divided, it did not return to the floor for debate. However, subsequent reports from the individual colleges indicate that the degree preparation was strongly encouraged but the two-fold program was retained.[53] In 1898 the non-degree preparatory course content was revised.[54] Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and English were retained but in lesser amounts; science and philosophy requirements were slightly increased; and the history requirements were substantially increased both in scope and time. This corresponded with a general growth of interest in history in English Canada.

The last area of inquiry is that of church-college relations. As noted earlier the colleges entered the Union retaining their former relationships with the new church[55] but issues arose forcing change and a new common relationship. By 1879 it was established that the General Assembly might make course recommendations but could not enforce uniformity. The question of theological degrees was also raised in the early years. In 1877, Knox College, which had never obtained degree granting powers, proposed the creation of an overriding degree granting "Presbyterian College" while leaving the educational task to the individual colleges. A committee appointed by the General Assembly was unable to present a unified opinion and the issue lingered on until 1880 when the General Assembly directed the Toronto and Montreal colleges to seek degree granting powers. This was done and the acquisition of the powers settled the issue.[56] The educational task was thus left to the colleges.

However, the General Assembly refused to abdicate its responsibilities regarding the expansion of programs within the colleges or the college system itself. In 1884 it was passed that appointments to theological chairs and the opening of new colleges would be subject to General Assembly approval.[57] This was, in effect, the extension of an old "Free Church" principle to the formerly "Kirk" colleges. However obtaining control over non-existent colleges was found by the General Assembly to be simpler than exerting influence in the affairs of existing institutions. The 1885 plan to consolidate the funds of the Ontario and Quebec colleges had also proposed the consolidation of the colleges themselves, but so capable was the leadership of Principal J. Forrest of Dalhousie and so strong was the opposition of the various college supporters who feared the loss of "their" college, that consolidation was limited to the funds.[58] The issue of professorial appointments arose again in 1892 with Queen's leading the support for the old "Kirk" approach against the formerly "Free Church" colleges in Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, and Winnipeg. After thorough study it was agreed that the boards of colleges having vacancies would receive nominations from the presbyteries and would submit these and any they cared to add to the General Assembly which would make the final appointment.[59] While this change recognized the role of the old "Kirk" college Boards, it did not change the basically "Free Church" principle of appointment. However, control of professorial appointments by the General Assembly did not mean subsequent interference in the performance of their duties. In 1904 the Presbytery of Toronto, concerned about the course content at Knox College, moved to have a General Assembly standing committee established to supervise the colleges. After vigorous debate in which the professors led the opposition to the proposal, it was defeated.[60] Such was hardly surprising for such centralized control over theological colleges was foreign to the traditions of both the "Free Church" and the "Kirk." That such a proposal received such limited even if spirited support was a reflection of the efforts of the clergy to keep their people abreast of current theological thought.

In general the church-college relations were those of sharply defined jurisdictions. The General Assembly had the final voice in professorial appointments and the extension of the college system; the colleges had jealously guarded rights in matters affecting faculty, students, and curriculum.

Two features of the Presbyterian college policy, unfortunate as the future would prove, should be noted. First, no means existed by which colleges could be closed or amalgamated for any reason, no matter how laudable, so long as they could command the support of their local constituency. The lingering death of Morrin College is an example in point. Opened in 1861, the college grew to a student body of almost 200 in the 1870's and then began to decline. By 1892 it could attract only thirty-five students of which nine were in theology. Faculty was gradually reduced in proportion.[61] The obituary of the college finally appeared in 1900.

> Morrin College . . . is to be closed, and the commission was reappointed to guard the interests of the Church in the disposition of the Capital Fund, which is somewhat involved by the conditions of the bequest.[62]

So obvious was the pointlessness of maintaining the college for years after it had passed its period of usefulness that the closure failed to draw any word of protest from the General Assembly or Presbyterian press. Second, by failing to provide a permanent Board or standing committee on colleges, the whole General Assembly was placed in the rôle. Hence there was no means for overall decision making in college affairs between General Assemblies nor any assured continuity in the committees on colleges. Further, specific problems did not receive the depth of attention which they deserved, or they could become subject to region or party tensions within the court.

2. PRESBYTERIAN POLICIES (1910 - 1925)

During this period the Presbyterian policies underwent major changes to meet new conditions. Before considering the policies, it is necessary to examine the conditions.

Of great importance to the Presbyterians was the maintenance of high standards of education and character in the ministry. Educationally they required a great deal--six years of college or university at a time when the training required for a school teacher was generally equated with university entrance. Yet any pre-1910 tendencies to change were in the direction of raising the standard. As to maintaining the standards of character, the Presbyterians were successful. The General Assembly records and Presbyterian press were singularly free of complaint regarding the character and training of ministers. Naturally the Presbyterians were anxious to train sufficient numbers of ministers to meet the needs of the church. Statistically they appeared to fail in this regard. In 1875 they claimed 88,228 communicants and 627 ministers; by 1910 the figures had grown to 279,556 and 1,087.[63] The minister-communicant ratios for the two years were 1/140.7 and 1/257.1. Regionally the ratios in 1875 were 1/159.8 in the Maritimes and 1/137.2 in the central provinces. The Western work was then so small as to make a ratio meaningless.[64] In 1910 the ratios had changed greatly: 1/229.7 in the Maritimes, 1/271.0 in central Canada, and 1/123.8 in the four Western provinces.[65] While these figures suggest that the central provinces and the Maritimes were suffering most for lack of ministers, there were no expressions of concern from either area in the General Assembly records or in the Presbyterian press. The available ministers were adequate to perform the services deemed necessary by the congregations of the areas. Not so the West, from whence there arose a continual cry for more and better suited men. In effect the Presbyterian Church was challenged to meet the needs of a frontier situation.

In 1875 Presbyterianism in the region west of Ontario to the Rockies consisted officially of four ministers serving 495 communicants[66] but it was generally recognized that there were large numbers of Presbyterians in the West not being served by the church. Organization of the work consisted of a recently formed presbytery centering on Winnipeg, while the rest of the region was under Home Missions supervision. By 1880 it was so apparent that the task of missionizing the West was beyond the capacity of existing means and methods that the General Assembly of 1881 followed the suggestion of members from the West and took the step, unprecendented in Canadian Presbyterianism, of creating the office of "Superintendent of Missions in the Northwest." The first occupant of the office was James Robertson of Winnipeg.[67] He remained in the office until his death in 1902. His long and direct involvement with the Western situation gave him deep insight into its problems, the solution of which he saw as being "men, organization, visibility, and finance."

"Visibility" would be automatic with the presence of missionaries and the construction of facilities in the West. "Organization" would be provided by Robertson in the initial stages and he would have two functions--to organize and supervise the mission work in the West, and to represent the interests of this work in the

General Assembly. As the work developed, presbyteries and synods would be formed and assume their responsibilities, leaving Robertson free to concentrate on the remaining mission areas. As it transpired, by 1902 the Presbyterians had 258 organized fields in the West, eighteen presbyteries, and three synods. Robertson's policies were continued after his death and by 1910 the work had further grown to 503 fields, twenty-eight presbyteries, and four synods, and the area served had been extended to British Columbia and the Yukon.[68] However, "visibility" and "organization" were dependent upon "finance" and "men" and these aspects were fraught with difficulties.

Naturally efforts were made to make the Western work self-supporting but this was, particularly in the initial stages, impossible. As in all frontier situations, the people were compelled to devote all their resources and energy to the creation of a means of production and only when production passed the subsistence level could they divert some of their resources to institutions such as the church and school. Aware of this, the General Assembly of 1882 organized the "Church and Manse Building Fund" through which interested individuals anywhere in Canada would channel their support for the construction of these facilities. During Robertson's term of office the fund assisted in the building of 419 churches, 90 manses, and four school houses. Through the Home Missions Committee the General Assembly and the church at large were able to lend support for the payment of missionaries. Robertson was tireless in promoting support for both these agencies.[69] Even so the Western work suffered from a chronic shortage of funds.

Finding sufficient suitable men was even a greater problem. To be sure, there were men in the West and a college in Winnipeg to train them, but the numbers willing to enter the work were small; hence Robertson was forced to seek men in the East. There he found more men with the necessary academic preparation but few with the rare combination of attitudes, stamina, and health necessary to face the rigors of the Western work. Regarding this he wrote

> Our young graduates in the East think that God calls them to places where the work is easy, the meals good and the beds soft, and that a call where work is hard and the climate severe must be from the Evil One, and I fear they act on this impression.[70]

Robertson searched for suitable men everywhere: in the colleges in the East, among Canadian students attending American universities, in the British universities, and in European universities, although he decided the available men from this last source would not be suitable. Turning to Manitoba College, he was able to arrange a program which enabled fields to be served on a year-round basis by two students without delaying the completion of their courses. Still the work was plagued by a shortage of suitable men. By 1900 Robertson was desperate to the point of proposing to the General Assembly that every ordinand be required to serve one year in Western work but the measure was defeated.[71] And this occurred at a time when Robertson could write in the *Westminster*,

> Commissioner McCreacy forecasts the influx of settlers to the West at 75,000 for 1900, for 1898 it was 40,000 and 50,000 for 1899. . . .
>
> It does seem a pity, while this in-rush is taking place, that our young men in larger numbers should not come to the help of the Church. . . . The Church that will look after this inflowing population will reap the reward of its aggressive enterprise in years to come, while the Church that

> neglects this work will likely lack numbers and be lean in spiritual life. Almost every mail from the West brings letters clamoring for more men. . . .[72]

The Western situation revealed two weaknesses in Presbyterian policy. First, it was failing to produce adequate numbers of ministers to serve the needs of the Church. Second, the heavy emphasis on high academic attainment and uniformity in the ministry was fostering a professionalism and sense of class that made many men unsuitable for work in the West where character and adaptability were more valued.

During these same years the Presbyterians became increasingly aware of another problem involving the ministry, although this was not reflected in the minister-communicant ratios noted earlier. This was the lack of effectiveness in serving the urban communities. In 1900 G. M. Grant wrote,

> The Down-Town and the Up-Town Church
>
> The great fact of modern civilization is the increasing centralization of business, and, therefore, the enormous increase of the city as compared with the country population. Hence arise serious problems, both for the country and city churches, and, unless these are faced and solved as they arise, evil conditions for the religious life grow, until the problems become practically incapable of solution. All the while, indifference, mental inertia, and sectionalism and sectarianism under the name of vested interests combine to prevent timely action being taken.[73]

Grant's criticism of conservatism and vested interest in the clergy was mild indeed compared to that expressed in a 1905 *Queen's Quarterly* article,

> The Church and the Man
>
> That the church is losing the man from both pulpit and pew is a well recognized fact, that the loss is fatal to the church is self evident. . . . During the last forty years there has been little or no change in the church in Canada, while the

> life of man materially, politically, intellectually, and spiritually has been vastly changed, almost revolutionized. . . . The church has stood still, the people have advanced, there is a divergence, it is constantly growing and will continue to grow. The remedy is a very simple one, simple in theory, the church must meet the changed conditions. . . . [The man] of liberty, reason and progress . . . does not find in the Reformed churches the reality corresponding to these ideals. The clergy rule the Reformed churches as effectually as the priests do the Roman Catholic Church. . . . The last forty years have brought us the full tide of democratic sway in civic, educational, social and commercial affairs and it is difficult for the self-assertive democrat of Saturday, who shares in the control of the great affairs of the world civil and moral to resign himself on Sunday to a form of government in the religious sphere in which piety, morality, character or initiative count for nothing, and position and tradition count for everything. . . . The government of the church is reserved to a distinct class, and the layman is a mere cipher which can only count by having a clerical figure placed before it. . . . Wherever there is organized labor there is a certain amount of antagonism to the church, or, let us say, to the clerical control of the church. . . .[74]

Whatever the validity of the reasoning in the article, Presbyterianism in the years 1900 - 1910 was increasingly aware that the Western work was suffering from problems of numbers and quality of men and the urban work was also in difficulty although the cause was less certain. To some the answer, particularly in regard to the West, lay in Church Union which had been proposed in 1902 and concerning which negotiations had been proceeding.[75] During the interim before the Union was completed, this element would lend support to all manner of efforts to solve the problems of the times. Their efforts would be supported in some areas by a second element that perceived the need for change but would not go to the lengths of Union. The efforts of both would be opposed by an extremely conservative element that could not or would not see any need for change.

The Ministry

In 1910 the shortage of personnel was so apparent that the General Assembly appointed a "Committee on the Supply of Students, Missionaries and Ministers."[76] The committee was later expanded from thirty to thirty-six members and was chosen to give representation to both clergy and laity, urban and rural, churches of various sizes, special ministries within the church, and all geographic regions of Canada. Reports of the committee were presented to the General Assemblies of 1911 and 1912.[77]

These reports, while affirming the concept of a uniform ministry, advocated a "special emergency" course to prepare men for service limited to Western mission fields. The specific course content will be considered elsewhere but it should be noted that the proposed course placed great emphasis upon readily applicable skills and knowledge rather than upon high academic standards. To be sure there was no intention on the part of the General Assembly that the program should be regarded as other than a solution for a "special emergency" but its adoption of the proposal was an admission that the needs of congregations might differ and that the existing program was not necessarily suitable for all candidates for the ministry. This was a milestone indeed. Robertson had never suggested, even in his most frustrated hour, that the needs of the West be met by compromising the educational standards. Any possibility that men trained in the "special emergency" course would affect the policy decisions of the church was prevented by limiting the course to men for Western mission fields. As such they had no direct voice in presbytery, synod, or General Assembly, but were spoken for by the Superintendent of Missions. As will be seen later, the main opposition to the program came from the colleges.

The entry of many ministers into the chaplaincy during the 1914-18 War extended the minister shortage to eastern Canada and the enlistment of many student ministers and potential candidates made the future supply bleak indeed. Moreover it was at this time that concern was more frequently expressed concerning the effect of the church in urban areas.

> The Gospel and Social Service
>
> There can be no difference of opinion among Christians about the primary importance of preaching the Gospel. It is quite true that no kind of social service can bring life to those who are dead in trespass or sin. Civic reform cannot save men from eternal death. . . . But to give the gospel its due place is not to rule out social service from the program of the church. . . . It is surely folly to think that if men are living in surroundings that expose them to constant temptation, where the struggle for existence brutalizes, and the spiritual influences of life are wanting, the church has nothing to do with these circumstances. . . . To "clean up a city" may be as truly part of the Church's task as to conduct an evangelistic campaign.[78]

> The Call of the City to the Church
>
> The mission fields . . . are great and vitally important . . . but in the number of people to be reached, and in their accessibility, the mission fields of our cities are unique.
>
> Consider these staggering figures . . . over 100,000 non-English speaking people in Montreal beside French, and not a tithe of them being reached by any church; another 100,000 in Toronto, . . . proportionately large numbers in Winnipeg, Vancouver, Halifax, St. John, Sidney, Ottawa and Hamilton. They are living in poverty, and therefore in overcrowded, and unfit and unhealthy housing conditions. The devil's degrading agencies are at their very doors. God's elevating agencies are pitifully few and far from most of them. . . . Work among them is the least expensive and the most fruitful work we do--in proportion to the numbers reached.[79]

To some the answer to this, like all problems, lay in church union.

The Union Situation

> . . . I believe . . . that church union is inevitable . . . For this demand springs naturally and irresistibly out of the fundamental conditions of Western life. . . . Only a united church can ever hope to solve the religious problems of the West . . . If the Church once realized that her life lies not so much in a creed to be treasured as in a task to be accomplished, no power in the world would keep her divided.
>
> And men are beginning in the West to catch that vision. They see not only wasted men and wasted money in the little village of a few hundred souls where four church spires lift themselves toward heaven, they know the tragedy lies deeper than that. It is that religion that ought to be a unifying power . . . splits that [community] life asunder. . . .
>
> And most pressing of all is the problem of the foreigner. . . .
>
> And then there is the problem of the cities, . . . the helplessness of the church in the modern city [where] life is at its best and at its worst.[80]

However, church union was not immediately possible so other solutions to the minister shortage had to be explored. The eastern churches did not, however, adopt the Western solution of employing men with lesser training. The War had amply demonstrated that non-professional people could readily adapt to new responsibilities in times of crisis. The solution proposed by the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church was the recruitment of suitable persons for non-pastoral tasks usually performed by ministers. Such persons were to receive training at the church's colleges and, whenever possible, such training programs were to be conducted cooperatively with other denominations. This redefinition of clergy-laity roles drew attention to the educational requirements of the ministry. The standards, it was decided in 1916, should be higher so the degree B.A. was made the "normal" prerequisite for theological study. No hardship was expected for those who could not meet this, as there was the provision for full-time service as a trained layman and, of course, there still existed the church's preparatory course and the "special emergency" course, although permission to undertake the latter was increasingly difficult to obtain.[81] The continued shortage of ministers led in 1918 to the radical proposal that laymen assume pastoral responsibilities without any formal training.

The Use of Lay Preachers

> Practically all the Nonconformist Churches in the Old Land find room and work in plenty for lay preachers, and it is from these that many of our best recruits are secured for the ministry. . . . To admit a number of consecrated laymen into the service would enable us to fill up the vacant and neglected places.[82]

The idea was not even discussed by the General Assembly. The 1916 program had been an affirmation of the Calvinist position that the clergy and laity differ only in function and that the function requires special training and is recognized by ordination. At the same time it had been recognized in 1916 that the special needs of the West and of some candidates for the ministry required modification of the ideal of a uniform ministry but safeguards had been provided against abuses. This position was maintained, although not without problems, until 1925.

The problem area that proved easiest to solve was that of program content. Complaints that lay worker training was unsatisfactory resulted in course revision in 1922 which better prepared the worker for his responsibilities.[83] More difficult was the tendency of students to avoid the rigors of the "normal" program, a tendency encouraged by some congregations and even presbyteries that were affected by the minister shortage. Further, there was an increasing tendency for men so trained to later use their satisfactory service in western mission work as justification for moving to positions in the more established parts of the church. In 1920 the Board of Education reported its concern that thirty per cent of men entering the ministry were doing so through the "special emergency" course. The General Assembly concurred in this expression of concern.[84] The following year the Board of Education report pointedly contained a concise outline of the preparatory and theological programs, the responsibility of the presbyteries regarding students, and the procedure by which exemptions to the regulations were to be obtained.[85] When this failed to reduce the influx of men into the "special emergency" course, the Board of Education cautioned the presbyteries to avoid actions that would encourage such men to expect special consideration.[86] In this way the Board gave notice that it would take issue with presbyteries challenging its role and the established regulations, and the "special emergency" course was restored to its role of a solution to Western needs rather than a convenience to students seeking to avoid the regular program.

The question of specialized training also arose in the post war period. The old "special emergency" course was not a prelude to this because it had been a compromise of standards rather than a fundamentally different kind of training from the usual program. The immediate cause for the question was the presence of large non-English speaking elements among the immigrant population of the West. In 1920 the Committee of Fifty, the committee representing

Presbyterianism in the Forward Movement, recommended that the Board of Education study the proposal.

> That one College be specially equipped for training workers among the Non-Anglo-Saxon population, and that consideration be given to the whole question of specialized training.[87]

The Board of Education responded with a reaffirmation of the uniform ministry in its 1921 report only to receive, in referral, a request from the Manitoba Synod for special training for workers going to "Ruthenian" communities.[88] Henceforth the issue centered on the training of missionaries for work among ethnic groups or for overseas service. Ministers serving industrial communities, the socially marginal areas, and other special groups did so with their basic training and such skills as they could acquire themselves. The requests for training for ethnic group workers were referred to the colleges in the area of concern.[89] This measure had several merits: The Board of Education was not required to repudiate its stand on a uniform ministry; such colleges as Manitoba and St. Andrew's in Saskatoon, which already had such programs, were able to continue them; and such programs, when they became unnecessary, could be terminated without reference to the General Assembly. Special training for overseas workers presented a different problem in that its need would be of far greater duration. In 1923 the task was assigned to the federated colleges in Montreal.[90] These measures went far in preserving the uniform ministry: ethnic group needs would be met locally and when the need passed, the programs could be quietly terminated; special training for overseas workers was concentrated in one institution with minimal disturbance to the overall college program.

Finally, there was the question of concession to the needs of students with special problems. Two minor changes in the regulations were made in 1918. Students with problems related to the study of Hebrew and Greek, subject to college senate and Board of Education approval, could pursue their Biblical studies using the English translation. Second, veterans would receive credit for studies undertaken in the Khaki University in England or the University of Vimy Ridge in France.[91] Neither of these greatly affected the high standard or uniformity of the ministry. The Board of Education, however, found the 1921 request to rule on the admission of women to theological studies a different matter. The question was referred to a committee which reported in 1922 that women could contribute greatly to the life of the church if given proper training but that they should not be ordained.[92] The question assumed a more pressing quality in 1923 when the General Assembly received an overture from the Presbytery of Saskatoon requesting ordination for a woman who had completed the course of study and was about to enter work among the new Canadians of Saskatchewan. The question of ordination for women was referred to the presbyteries.[93] The situation was complicated even further when it was reported to the 1924 General Assembly that a second woman had completed the theology course at Saskatoon and still another had completed more than one-half of the course at Knox College, Toronto. Moreover the Report on Remits noted that less than one-half of the presbyteries (39 of 79) had responded to the question of female ordination. Among these opinion varied greatly: seven approved, six disapproved, six favoured a special ordination giving limited privileges, and eighteen recommended deferred action for a variety of reasons. The General Assembly had but one avenue of escape from making a decision which it readily took--the matter was referred to the General Council of the United Church, the establishment of which was anticipated in the near future.[94]

In summary the Presbyterians remained remarkably consistent in their view of the ministry. It was regarded as a high calling requiring special training and recognized by ordination. It differed from the laity by reason of its functions. Ideally the ministry would be uniform in all ways but overpowering circumstances could be responded to by concessions so long as these were minimal and withdrawn as quickly as possible.

The Colleges

As earlier, attention will be directed to the areas of finance, student recruitment, curriculum, and church-college relations. In addition the new colleges of Western Canada will be examined.

The Presbyterians entered the period with a system of college financing based upon individual college endowment funds gathered from limited geographic constituencies and upon a General Fund gathered from the church at large. This remained the basic approach and, because of two policy changes to reduce costs, it proved adequate to the point of keeping all the colleges open.

The first of these innovations was cooperation with other denominations in college work. Such cooperation was proposed in 1900 by W. Caven, Principal of Knox College,[95] but the proposal was too advanced and was not acted upon or even commented upon by the religious or secular press. Growing interest in church union after 1902 brought a changed attitude. In 1912 a "Special Committee on Union Report" was appointed to examine various reports and information gathered from the presbyteries regarding their attitudes toward the proposed union. The committee recommended a delay in the consummation of union, but urged that during the interim

> . . . It be an instruction to the Boards of the Colleges to consider the possibility of cooperating with the colleges of other churches, situated in the same localities, so as to avoid unnecessary duplication in teaching.[96]

This was given General Assembly approval. By 1925 cooperation with other colleges was practised in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Edmonton, and Vancouver.[97] In all cases this cooperation involved the Methodists; in Vancouver it also included the Anglicans, and in Montreal it extended to the Anglicans and Congregationalists. The Presbyterians had also decided unilaterally to open their college in Saskatoon to Methodist and Congregationalist students on equal terms with Presbyterians but, as neither of the other churches had colleges nearby, it was not a matter of college cooperation as in the other centers. College cooperation reduced expenditures for faculty, libraries, and classroom facilities while often improving the programs. The success of this led, in 1921, to the adoption of a plan whereby faculty were exchanged among the Presbyterian Colleges, further reducing the overall number required.[98]

Recruitment of students for the ministry, prior to 1910, was the responsibility of the home, the sessions of the congregations, and the presbyteries. The results had not, however, been satisfactory. Between 1900 and 1910 the student body declined from 260 to 178. In 1911 the "Committee on the Supply of Students, Missionaries and Ministers" suggested several measures to remedy the situation.[99] Students were to be assured of adequate support during their years of study. No longer were students to be faced with the alternatives of marginal living standards during their training or a burden of indebtedness to be carried into a professional life that was never noted for the size of its remuneration. The colleges were urged to make their courses more "attractive" or, in more contemporary terms, relevant. More will be said of this in the section on curriculum. Recruitment was to be made more efficient by the use of ministers and professors acting in cooperation with the committees on Home Missions, Evangelism, and Sabbath Schools. This was a fairly open admission that the old reliance upon the home and the sessions of the congregation had not proven satisfactory. Indeed, the wording suggested that some agencies of the church had not been working or had even been working at cross-purposes. Lastly, it was suggested that the universities should be canvassed for recruits.

These suggestions were referred to the Board and Senates of the Colleges and to the presbyteries for consideration. The following year it was reported that the proposals had found wide favour and they were adopted by the General Assembly.[100] The following year the committee reported a cordial reception for their efforts, and that convenors and committees for recruitment were being appointed at the presbytery level. Further, it was reported that a central registry of students for the ministry was being compiled. The General Assembly expressed its approval.[101] So effective were these measures that between 1910 and 1914 the student body rose from 178 to 224. The war brought a sharp reversal to the trend and in 1917 there were only 100 students for the ministry. The following year the Board of Education report advocated vigorous recruiting among ministers' sons, "teen-agers," and returned soldiers. It also urged making recruitment a primary concern of the Forward Movement.[102] In this last matter it was successful; the objectives of the Forward Movement became "witness, providing trained personnel, and raising funds for the church's mission."[103]

To digress briefly, the Presbyterians responded well in regard to the financial aspect of the Forward Movement campaign. In 1920 it was reported that $5,042,303 had been subscribed while synod allocations had totalled $4,000,000.[104] However "pledging" and "paying" are quite different things. Still the amount in excess of $3,000,000 received by 1921 was of great assistance to the church.[105]

The enthusiasm generated by the Forward Movement also affected the attitude toward student recruitment. In 1920 the Presbyterian Board of Sabbath Schools and Young Peoples Societies set as one of its objectives "1,000 recruits for the Ministry and other Christian Life Callings."[106] The same year the General Assembly appointed a committee on "Life Service and Mission Education" to coordinate the recruitment activities of the various departments of the church. Funds for recruitment activities, literature, and bursary aid were made available.[107] None of this was very original but rather a slightly modified version of the proposals of the 1911 committee which only partially had been implemented and had not proven themselves because of the war. It was also in 1920, on the recommendation of the committee representing the Presbyterians in the Forward Movement, that the General Board of the Presbyterian Church was established. It was to be responsible for inter-departmental matters such as the gathering and disbursement of funds, training of personnel, publications, and the gathering and circulation of information.[108] In 1921 the Life Service Committee, as the coordinating recruitment committee had come to be known, was granted representation on the General Board. In one decade recruitment had changed from the level of informal home and congregational encouragement of the "call" to divine service, to that of a systematic canvas of the church by a high pressure committee able to draw upon the support of other committees and departments of the church as well as upon its purse. Commenting on the task at hand, one Presbyterian analyzed it as a conflict with the general spirit of the times.

> Young Canadians and the Ministry
>
> For many years the Presbyterian Church in Canada has had to face an increasing shortage in the number of young Canadians offering themselves for the ministry. . . . [This is a result of] the fundamental change which has taken place in the general life and atmosphere of Canadian homes during the past twenty years. . . . In most homes there is little time for . . . family worship. . . . Sunday, especially in Western Canada, has become a day of pleasure rather than a day of rest and worship. . . . [Many] parents are opposed to [their sons entering the ministry.] Its . . . grinding poverty and distress [make them] prefer to see their boy in almost any other profession. . . . The minister of twenty-five years ago was a heroic figure. He

> was clothed with divine authority and was conscious of the fact. . . . The time will come again when . . . he ceases to be afraid of his constituency.[109]

Yet by 1922 the Life Service Committee had conducted a variety of recruitment activities, had established procedures for its activities, and could report that positive results were in evidence.[110]

This frantic recruitment was set against the background of a growing concern over "leakage" from the ministry. So long as the number leaving had been negligible the reasons had not been seriously investigated; as the numbers increased, theories as to the cause were advanced. One blamed the congregations but offered no solution.

> The Shortage of Ministers
>
> The subject in general may be regarded from two points of view--the relation of the minister to the Church, and the relationship of the Church to the minister. The compelling call of the Church is that it affords the minister an opportunity of preaching the gospel. . . . If the conditions of the ministerial avocation were far harder . . . men would still be found willing to endure. . . . It is another thing that the people who profit by the spiritual ministrations of God's servant should thoughtlessly or callously permit him to suffer . . . [such] God will surely call . . . to account.[111]

The findings of a 1920 study of the matter by the Board of Home Missions and Social Service deserves attention for this Board was responsible for manning the stations on the frontier and in the least affluent sections of the cities and so was highly sensitive to the problem.

> Why Ministers Leave the Church
>
> The leakage of men from the ministry is so serious as to present a formidable difficulty in the promoting of full efficiency in the work of the Church. It gives grave concern to find men who have in many cases taken seven years of preparatory study, abandoning the calling, some after only a few years of trial of it, and others after experience extending over one-third or one-half the working lifetime. . . .

> The following reasons are suggested as operative:
>
> 1. Inability to make both ends meet upon the regulation salary. . . .
> 2. Anxiety owing to apparent impossibility of making adequate provision for the education of children, or the exigencies of old age.
> 3. . . . Temperamental peculiarities or physical disabilities, which cause [men] to despond regarding their capacity of accomplishing satisfactory work in the pastorate. Sometimes a man's wife may find the conditions too trying for her disposition.
> 4. Lack either of full conviction . . . or of ability to adapt perceptions of such truth to the spiritual needs of men in an age of religious perplexity.
> 5. Attraction . . . of gain, or comfort afforded by other callings.
> 6. Arrival at an age when too great difficulty attends continuance in a pastorate, and the absence of any recognized plan by which a new pastorate can be sought and found.
>
> The view of your Committee is that in only a few cases would it be worthwhile for the Church to take steps to induce such men to return, beyond the steps already taken through the raising of the minimum stipend, etc. It is regarded as probable that men who feel the call would return of their own volition.[112]

No word of this appeared in the Presbyterian press and it was not until 1921 that the general theme in very muted terms was presented to the General Assembly in the Life Service Committee report. The report stated that men were leaving because of financial and/or housing hardship, that some regarded "too lightly" their office, and that still others found scope for their services in other social service fields such as the Y.M.C.A. Moreover the report concluded that the leakage was not beyond that of "other callings."[113] However much of the problem of leakage might be glossed over by a comparison with "other callings," the supply of ministers for the future looked thin indeed when the Board of Education report for that year presented statistics showing that the candidates per

10,000 Presbyterian families in 1881 was 28, in 1901 it was 14, and in 1921 it was 7. This information was made public through the Presbyterian press.[114]

Painful as it was to the Presbyterians that numbers of their ministers were leaving their posts and that the numbers of candidates were decreasing, the list of their sorrows was not complete. Prior to 1910 over 400 ministers had been admitted from other denominations at an annual average of over eleven. During the period 1911 to 1921 over 210 applications were received for an average of almost 20 per year.[115] As in the earlier period most of these were Presbyterians (c. 100) with Americans in the large majority (c. 25). Congregationalists followed (c. 55) and most of them were Canadian (c. 25). Baptists moved into third place (c. 30) and, as before, were mainly Canadian (c. 25). Methodism fell to a weak fourth (c. 10). Most of the applications were accepted. This welcome supply of personnel came to an end after 1922. The struggle between the union and anti-union factions within the Presbyterian Church was gaining in intensity and both sides were reluctant to admit ministers who might be inclined to support the opposing faction. Moreover ministers were reluctant to enter a church so wracked with dissension and with the issue of union so undecided. In the four years 1922 to 1925 there were only nine applications for entry, almost all of which were withdrawn or rejected. With ministerial leakage increasing, student enrollment declining, and the influx of men from other denominations all but ended, the shortage of ministers became a crucial issue. Yet neither faction chose to use the issue in their quarrel over union. The point was too easily turned in either direction; it could as easily be blamed on the delay as on the prospect of union.

As of 1910 the curriculum had experienced twelve years of relative stability. Preparatory courses in degree and non-degree patterns were available, although the former were more favoured in certain circles, and the three year theological program was generally accepted. Requests for exemptions from these programs were subject to General Assembly approval which was not readily granted. The object of the curriculum had been to create a uniform ministry of which the members would be as far as possible interchangeable in the offices of the church.

The "Committee on the Supply of Students, Missionaries and Ministers," appointed in 1910, departed from this principle in the preparation of its report. As noted earlier the committee contained representation that was both lay and clerical, from all parts of the country, from various departments of the church, and from congregations of various sizes and both urban and rural settings. Moreover the committee was created to meet the serious shortage of men for service in the West. The 1911 report of the committee was, as could only be expected, a compromise position. The report[116] expressed support for the old ideals of a highly trained and uniform ministry and then recommended the "special emergency" program to meet the needs of the West. This would create a class of lesser trained personnel for service in limited circumstances. The course would be nine years in length and would be taken by men serving in the field under close supervision by neighbouring ministers. The course was intended to provide necessary skills and knowledge in the shortest possible time and consisted of the following,

> English Bible, English language (Grammar, Composition, and Literature), History (British and Universal), Theology (Biblical and Systematic), Apologetics (including Comparative Religion and Missions), Preaching and Sermon Preparation, and Sociology.

Other recommendations related to the regular program were that opportunity should be given to men desiring to prepare for advanced training in limited areas, and that the Greek and Hebrew requirements should be reduced for men who lacked skill or interest in linguistic studies. The report was referred to the colleges and presbyteries.

In 1912 the committee, having heard from the colleges and presbyteries, submitted a second report to the General Assembly.[117] Recommendations regarding the normal course remained the same except that the Hebrew and Greek requirements were restored in full except in cases where a college senate might substitute other courses of equivalent value for one of the languages. This was a change in the nature rather than the standard of the program. The proposed "special emergency" course was referred for further study to the presbyteries and the colleges.

During the year the misgivings of the colleges were given public expression in the Presbyterian press.

> The Standard of Ministerial Education
>
> The whole question of the supply of students for the Christian ministry and the character of the training that they need is one that is causing anxious consideration at the present time. . . . The so-called "crisis" of our own day, and in this country, is due to the fact that the number of regular candidates offering themselves for this particular service seems to be smaller instead of larger and the speedy increase of population in the West, with its consequent call for new congregations, makes a serious demand which can only be met

> with great difficulty. This is not a question for one Church; it is pressing heavily on all the Protestant denominations. . . .
>
> We are told that "there should be, in view of the rapid expansion of the Church's field of operations, a special, temporary emergency course, with full ordination given after a period of successful probation in the pastorate." . . .
>
> This takes the place of the regular Arts and Theology course for men who, except in special cases, are over twenty-five years of age, and who show efficiency in the mission field at every stage of their course. These men, according to this proposal, should have "extra-mural work supervised by correspondence throughout the entire nine years' course," with "ordination" at the end of the nine. It is evident that if this work is seriously attempted by earnest students and competent teachers much useful information and real discipline may be acquired during this period of painful probation. When compared with the course that most of the regular students now follow, viz., four years in Arts and three in Theology, with considerable experience in the mission fields, this course looks thin and poor, and it may turn out to be worse than it appears to be unless some effective machinery for education and supervision is called into existence. . . .[118]

The Home Missions Board, which would benefit greatly by the program, did not question the content but indicated to the 1913 General Assembly[119] that it would prefer the course to be offered through the colleges during the summer months during which time the fields would be served by regular program students. Despite this suggestion and the misgivings of the colleges, the General Assembly adopted the "special emergency" course as recommended by the committee.

The following year the new Board of Education recommended that the colleges, subject to Board approval, be allowed to offer diverse courses as long as "such adaptations . . . be a full equivalent for the Assembly's requirements." This covered the course adjustments to satisfy the interests of students desiring to specialize or preparing for post-graduate study as well as those seeking to avoid the full language requirements. At the same time a multitude of requests for exemptions from the normal program descended upon the Board. In attempting to accommodate special cases, the Board found so many students claiming special circumstances that the idea of a regular or normal preparation for ordination was almost destroyed. The Board responded with the recommendation that presbyteries examine candidates for ordination to ensure that they "have approached as closely as possible to the educational standard set by the church."[120]

Although fewer recruits for the ministry appeared in 1915 because of the war, the trend continued. By 1916 concern for the educational standards and the new programs for laymen produced the necessary force and opportunity for a reaction. In that year the colleges, particularly in the West, were directed to discontinue all preparatory work, the normal course leading to ordination was set at the degree B.A. followed by three years of theology (no mention was made of variations in the theology programs offered by the different colleges), older men were to be permitted a three year non-degree Arts course followed by a full three year theology program under close Board and college Senate supervision, and students unable to qualify for these programs were to make application to the Assembly for a special course.[121]

In their application, the 1916 regulations would produce a ministry composed of a large segment of degree holding ministers; a smaller segment of men with substantially the same training but without degrees; and a very small, highly selected segment of men with substantially lower levels of training serving in the Western mission stations. This was, in effect, the pre-1910 uniform ministry modified by a special group to serve the frontier. By isolating the last group the wider life of the church was relatively unaffected; by standardizing the first two programs, the curriculum planning and operations of the colleges were vastly simplified.

The remaining years before the 1925 Union saw no major curriculum policy changes and only minor changes in application. The latter were in relation to the veterans. In 1917 summer schools were instituted to facilitate their training; in 1918 it was passed that courses taken in the Khaki University in England and in the University of Vimy Ridge in France would be given full credit and that in some cases the Greek and Hebrew requirements would be waived. In 1921 all special treatment of veterans was ended.[122]

Church-college relations in 1910, it will be recalled, were characterized by sharply defined jurisdictions: the General Assembly was responsible for professorial appointments, extensions of the college system, and general policy; the colleges had jealously guarded rights in matters affecting students, faculty, and curriculum.

The 1911 report of the Committee on the Supply of Students, Missionaries and Ministers[123] called for the establishment of a Board of Education for the purposes of coordinating the work of the colleges, standardizing the courses and examinations, visiting the institutions, advising on college finance problems, and aiding in recruitment. This proposal was referred to the Boards and Senates of the colleges and to the presbyteries.

The response from the colleges was quite negative in regard to the proposals affecting courses, examinations, and finance. The 1912 committee report[124] omitted matters of courses and examinations from the responsibilities of the proposed Board. The revised list of responsibilities included the "general educational policy of the church:" and a limited number of specific matters such as students in unusual circumstances, the evaluation of training of ministers coming from other denominations, recruitment for the ministry, providing for the religious needs of students in church or non-church educational institutions, visitation of the various church schools and colleges and the preparation of reports to the Assembly upon applications from the colleges for assistance or approval in the case of projected colleges. Thus the Board was not to be voiceless in financial matters but it would be limited to an advisory role in areas already established as General Assembly responsibilities. As the principal college objections had been satisfied, the modified proposals were referred for study only to the presbyteries.

The presbyteries were satisfied except in regard to the size of the proposed Board. Hence it was recommended and passed in 1913 that the Board of Education would consist of nine ministers and three elders appointed by the General Assembly and one member from each of the eight college senates.[125] Board of Education reports for the years 1914 to 1925 indicate serious attempts by the Board to fulfill its responsibilities. However, as noted earlier, recruitment results were disappointing.

The establishment of the Board of Education in 1913 did not significantly change the church-college relationship but did provide a means for maintaining a measure of continuity in college affairs at the General Assembly level and a kind of clearing house for information.

Between 1914 and 1925 three efforts were made to change the church-college relationship. In 1918 the General Assembly appointed a Committee on College Consolidation to examine the possibility of closing or consolidating some of the colleges as a solution to the financial problem and in the light of the reduced student enrollment. The committee found that regional and college loyalties outweighed General Assembly influence with the result that the plans to close or consolidate colleges were quietly dropped as they had been in 1885.[126] Similarly the old issue of professorial appointments was resurrected in 1920 when the Montreal presbytery sought to have such appointments made by a committee of the General Assembly which would receive nominations from only presbyteries or synods. This ultra "Free Church" approach was rejected and the 1894 compromise was retained.[127] The final effort to modify the church-college relationship came in the 1922 recommendation from the Board of Education that a Superintendent of Education and a Board of Examiners be appointed for the whole church. The response from the colleges was so negative that the matter did not return to the floor of the General Assembly,[128] all of which was very similar to the 1911 proposal that courses and examinations be standardized and the response given to the proposal at that time.

In summary the Presbyterians, by 1894, achieved a fairly satisfactory relationship between church and college. When this proved inefficient, as it did by 1910, they added a Board of Education which solved the most pressing problems but did not change the fundamental balance of the relationship. All subsequent efforts to change the relationship, whether by the General Assembly, the presbyteries, or the Board of Education, were stoutly resisted.

During this period the Presbyterians were confronted by unique problems in their colleges at Saskatoon and Edmonton. The circumstances of these colleges were quite different from those of the other "western" colleges in Winnipeg and Vancouver. Manitoba College, it will be recalled, had been opened in 1870 as an Arts college and a Theological program had been added in 1883. Over the years Manitoba College had made adjustments to meet changing circumstances and needs. In 1877 it participated in the formation of the University of Manitoba and in 1914 had transferred much of its Arts work to the University. Beginning in 1889 it had cooperated with the Methodist college in Arts instruction and later in Theology. The college had acquired permanent buildings in 1882 and these had been enlarged in 1892. By 1895 the college was largely free from debt and had built a sizable endowment fund with contributions from interested people in Manitoba, eastern Canada, and Great Britain.[129] Hence Manitoba College was well established before 1910 while the other western colleges were in the process of being started.

The college in Vancouver was opened in 1908 under the name of Westminster Hall. While it early acquired a site on the University of British Columbia campus at Point Grey, it remained in temporary quarters until after 1925. Until 1923, when it began to cooperate with the Anglican and Methodist colleges, Westminster Hall conducted its program during the spring and summer months, thus enabling students to serve mission fields during the months that students from the other colleges were not available. The spirit of Robertson must have approved, for this was but a slight modification of the plan he had devised for Manitoba College years before. By 1925 Westminster Hall had graduated seventy-two men in Theology and had given partial programs to thirty others.[130] Apart from its choice of months of operation, Westminster Hall did not differ greatly within itself from the colleges in Saskatoon or Edmonton. However its external circumstances were significantly different. Presbyterianism had had a longer period in which to become settled in British Columbia. Presbyterian missionaries had been at work since 1861 and presbyteries had been organized since 1875.[131] It was not until the 1880's that mission stations in significant numbers were opened in what later became Saskatchewan and Alberta[132] and years before the region between Manitoba and British Columbia was organized as presbyteries and synods.[133] The populations of the two areas also differed greatly. British Columbia was far more Anglo-Saxon and English-speaking in character while Saskatchewan and Alberta were more mixed in population. There was also a great difference in the economic base. British Columbia was primarily interested in mining, lumbering, and fishing while the prairies were agricultural. An analysis of the problems of Saskatchewan, which were essentially common to Alberta, was published in 1921 by E. H. Oliver,[134] principal of the college in Saskatoon. The situation then was still much the same as in earlier years except that the problems were more entrenched and the people, having lost some of their pioneer enthusiasm, were turning to more radical solutions.

The Problems of Saskatchewan

> [The problems] . . . are in the main the following:
>
> (I) The Business of pioneering. In some respects this has been a far from difficult land to pioneer; . . . easy to travel, no great forests have had to be cleared, the land has been fertile, . . . after the half-breed uprising . . . no aboriginal inhabitants to cause trouble, . . . [and] possible to grow garden stuff and wheat and oats so that the question of actual food has not materially hampered.
>
> But in other respects it has not been easy to pioneer this land. Men have had to contend with--(a) the absence of [construction] material . . . (b) almost exclusively rural character of our industry. . . .
>
> (II) Social and Economic Isolation. This is a country of magnificent distances. . . . Henry Ford . . . and Alexander Graham Bell have proved benefactors. But the men on the frontiers cannot get cars and telephones, and the land is very, very wide. In economic life the farmer's industry has been controlled by men outside the Province. . . . The West sets its heart on the Hudson Bay Railway and it lingers. The West wanted reciprocity. The Dominion would have none of it, and returned . . . Borden. In that hour the Farmers' Political movement was born.
>
> (III) The Problem of a Mixed Population. . . .
>
> (IV) Speculation. . . .
>
> (V) Education. . . .
>
> (VI) The Community Spirit. . . . They [the Westerners] think in terms of the present and the local.[135]

These factors naturally impinged upon the colleges in these provinces. Robertson College, Edmonton, and Presbyterian Theological College (later renamed St. Andrew's College in 1924) in Saskatoon were opened in 1911 and 1914 respectively. Both began in temporary buildings. Both were organized and operated under the policies prevailing in the Presbyterian colleges at that time. Such policies included cooperation with provincial universities and with neighbouring denominational colleges. As noted earlier, Robertson College was able to cooperate with the existing Methodist College and also with the University of Alberta. The Saskatoon college cooperated with the University of Saskatchewan, and at the specific direction of the General Assembly, admitted Methodist and Congregationalist students on equal terms with Presbyterians.[136] However it was evident by 1915, the date of the first Board of Education visitation, that the policies were not suited to the conditions of the western prairies and that the expectations of the church were not being realized. The report of the Board of Education to the General Assembly noted a number of specific problem areas.[137] Local support was insufficient to provide adequate buildings and equipment, to establish endowments, or even to meet operational costs. In part the problems had been solved by the aid from Women's Guilds and by cooperative arrangements but it was obvious that existing financial practices would not be satisfactory for the Western colleges. While noting that the colleges had attracted a number of promising candidates, the report qualified its praise with the phrase "even if few of them be of Canadian birth." The presence of this element forced the colleges to do extensive "back-work" to bring them up to the standard required for preparatory studies, thus placing a heavier burden upon the faculty. Finally, the report noted the beneficial effects of the colleges upon the universities with which they were associated. All this was a preamble to the Boards recommendations[138] which were that all the colleges should be retained and the most stringent economies possible be practiced in their operations. The continuing decline of students caused by the war made this even more imperative.

The Western colleges were severely affected by the 1916 decisions to make the degree B.A. the normal prerequisite for theology, to restrict admission to other programs, and to curtail all "back-work" activities.[139] Western enrollment in theology had never been high, the war had seriously reduced the existing and potential enrollments, and the 1916 regulations disqualified most of the remaining potential students. The continued dismal financial and enrollment situation led to an overture to the General Assembly from the Halifax Presbytery in 1918 requesting a review of college financing in general and the continued operation of the western colleges in particular.[140] After a detailed review of the matter, the question was referred to the presbyteries.[141] The inconclusive response from the presbyteries precluded any action in 1919[142] nor was the question raised again in the General Assembly prior to the Union of 1925. However the issue was not totally dead. From time to time defenses of the Western colleges appeared in the church press. Two that appeared in 1922, written by Walter Murray, President of the University of Saskatchewan, approached the issue in terms of the West and in terms of the impending Church Union.

> The Colleges and the Church
>
> Has the Presbyterian Church too many colleges in the West? There are four, one at each Provincial University. . . . Distances do not condemn the Western locations, nor do populations. . . . Both in increases the balance [compared to Nova Scotia] is in favour of the Western Provinces. . . . The fields for recruits and for influence are large. Each theological college is affiliated with the Provincial University; each has or will have a site on the University Campus, each is represented on the University senate; certain subjects taught in each are accepted by the University for a University degree. . . . Each . . . may make its contribution to the religious life of the students. . . . Each . . . is a vital center for

> Presbyterianism within the Province. There are many special problems which the colleges can aid in solving; . . . the Oriental problem in British Columbia, the New Canadian on the Prairies, the Social Service in the large cities and the Sunday School everywhere. The opportunities are there. Only vision and energy are needed to achieve great things. . . .
>
> Has the Church too many Colleges in the West? For nearly half a million Presbyterians she has established at four strategic points one in each large province. . . .[143]
>
> The Problem of the Church Colleges
>
> Two Assemblies [1914 and 1918] have seriously considered the College problem. . . . Then a solution was not possible because of the uncertainties of the War. Now Church Union perplexes. If church union is accomplished . . . the problem will disappear. If . . . [not] cooperation will be difficult if not impossible and competition will change the problem. . . . The only reasonable things to do at present are (1) to stand steady, declining large schemes of expansion, (2) to cooperate with other colleges . . . and (3) to decline to evacuate any strategic positions. . . . Not that the church cannot afford to support eight colleges if there is sufficient work for them to do. . . . The Baptist Church . . . , the Anglican . . . , the Methodist . . . , and the Roman Catholic . . . , carry a heavier burden because of their colleges . . .
>
> Two solutions seem possible, (1) union of the colleges of the different denominations at each University center. . . . (2) the Presbyterian Colleges . . . [should become] Divinity Halls . . . [as at] Oxford.[144]

In evaluating the Presbyterian policies of the period, the question is whether they provided ministers of the desired quality in sufficient numbers for the needs of the church. Earlier it was noted that few complaints regarding the quality of the ministry appear in the records of 1875 to 1910. After 1910 there were increasing complaints about the professionalism of the ministers which made them loath to serve in the less affluent urban areas or in mission stations. On the other hand there were complaints concerning the educational and cultural standards of many of the western ministers. Yet no one seemed to recognize that the needs of different areas and different types of congregations would require the services of men trained for particular circumstances. In effect, the concept of a uniform ministry was inappropriate to Canada and the compromises had been too limited. As to the quantity of ministers, earlier it was noted that between 1876 and 1910 the minister-communicant ratio changed from one minister to 149.8 communicants to one minister to 174.6, a rate of change of approximately seven-tenths of one communicant per minister per year. In 1925 the Presbyterian Church had 1685 ministers in parish work serving 379,762 members in full communion.[145] This was a ratio of one minister to 225.3 communicants. The rate of deterioration in the ratio in this latter period was 3.4 communicants per minister per year or almost five times the previous rate. Moreover there was a strong evidence that a trend was developing that would result in an even greater shortage of ministers. On a regional basis the ratios were 1/205.6 in the Maritimes, 1/283.1 in the central provinces, 1/175.8 in the prairie provinces, and 1/139.9 in British Columbia.[146] As before, the expressions of concern were that insufficient numbers of men were available for the West. The hope that the Western Colleges would provide sufficient ministers for Western needs had not been fulfilled. Yet in another sense the Western colleges had served a purpose. They demonstrated that a denominational approach was unsuited to Western needs, they provided scope for cooperative effort, and they became another argument in favour of union.

The union of 1925 marked the decision of those within the Presbyterian Church to meet the problems of the times with a new and untried solution even at the cost of shattering old customs and, if necessary, ties within their denomination. Such an attitude was common to other areas of life at the time, for this was the decade and almost the same year that Canada, for all practical purposes, became an independent nation. As the nation proceeded in this direction, the Presbyterian unionists took the stance that not only would union solve many contemporary problems but it would create a new kind of religious institution suited to the needs of the future. Editorially this view found expression in these terms,

> The Valley of Decision
>
> We are rapidly approaching the point where our ministers and congregations will have to decide whether they will remain with their Church when it enters the United Church or record their dissent and adopt some other course. . . . They may decide to go to a Church of another denomination . . . or for a new Presbyterian Church [with a view to preserving the past]. . . . There is another consideration which we think should have great weight with those who sincerely love the Presbyterian Church and who desire to uphold its honour . . . and glorious traditions . . . [this is, to] make the contribution of Presbyterianism a mighty factor in moulding and directing the future destiny of Canada that is to be.[147]

or again,

> Church Union and National Unity
>
> We have been looking, perhaps, too exclusively on the advantages to be gained by a closer alliance of our religious forces for achieving the great tasks facing the Churches in this new land, and have not stopped to consider the national significance of such a movement. . . . The fathers of Confederation were men of vision, and they realized that only by a closer unity of the British possessions on this continent was there any hope for the perpetuation of British institutions and the laying of the foundations of a great nation. . . . Confederation . . . has consolidated the political, commercial, and industrial interests of Canada and contributed so much to its prosperity. . . . Perhaps no other country in the world is thrust through with so many natural barriers. . . as Canada. . . . Common sympathies in the deeper things of life will overcome many material barriers to unity.[148]

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER II

[1] W. Gregg, *History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada* (Toronto, 1885), pp. 27-35, 55-60, 143-147, 155-157, 167-172. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875 - 1925* (Toronto, 1925), pp. 1-13. H. H. Walsh, *The Christian Church in Canada* (Toronto, 1956), pp. 21, 89, 95-97, 111, 113. For a discussion of Huguenot activities in North America under French and British rule see C. E. Reaman, *The Trail of the Huguenots* (London, 1963), pp. 136-231.

[2] C. E. Silcox, *Church Union in Canada* (New York, 1933), pp. 57-59. J. T. McNeill, *The History and Character of Calvinism* (New York, 1954), pp. 355-361. J. H. Nichols, *History of Christianity, 1650-1950* (New York, 1956), pp. 143-145.

[3] W. Gregg, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-45. W. L. Grant and F. Hamilton, *Principal Grant* (Toronto, 1904), pp. 49-51.

[4] J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 16-33; J. T. McNeill, "The Making of the Presbyterian Church in Canada," *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXVIII, 18 (30 April 1926), pp. 6-8; 19 (14 May 1926), pp. 8-9. C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-65, 469. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 210-212.

[5] Figures estimated or taken from W. Gregg, *op. cit.*, pp. 591-592, 596-598.

[6] *The Presbyterian*, (March, 1875), pp. 9, 49-64, 82-83; (April, 1875), pp. 91-93; (May, 1875), pp. 105-122; (July, 1875), pp. 162-182. *The Home and Foreign Record of the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces of British North America* (June, 1875), pp. 143-144; (July, 1875), pp. 197-204. *British American Presbyterian*, IV, 2 (19 February, 1875), p. 4; 3 (26 February 1875), p. 4; 18 (11 June 1875), p. 4. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 23-28, 31.

[7] R. G. Balfour, *Presbyterianism in the Colonies* (Edinburgh, 1899), p. 61. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 28-30, 103. C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-70. J. C. Goodfellow, "Origins of the United Church of Canada in British Columbia," *The Bulletin*, Committee on Archives, United Church of Canada, 7 (1954), pp. 33-36.

[8] *The Presbyterian* (July, 1875), p. 179.

[9] Presbyterian Church, *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly* (hereafter cited as *A.P.G.A.*) *(1876)*, p. appendices 117.

[10] C. W. Gordon, *The Life of James Robertson, D.D.* (Toronto, 1909), pp. 81-86. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 102-104. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 257-259.

[11] J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 116-136. G. Boyle, "The Foreign Missions Committee of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1854-1925," *The Bulletin*, Committee on Archives, United Church of Canada, 8 (1955), pp. 37-42.

[12] J. T. McNeill, *The History and Character of Calvinism*, pp. 374-375.

[13] C. M. Drury, "The Presbyterian Church in America," pp. 71-82; M. J. Hoffman, "The Reformed Church in America," pp. 131-139; W. E. McCulloch, "The United Presbyterian Church in America," pp. 210-217; *The American Church of the Protestant Heritage*, ed. V. Fern (New York, 1953). J. T. McNeill, *The History and Character of Calvinism*, pp. 377, 381-382.

[14] W. Gregg, *Short History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada* (Toronto, 1893), pp. 122-123, 138-139, 148-149, 166-170, 211-214. W. T. Gunn, *His Dominion* (Toronto, 1917), pp. 156-163. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 98-100. P. Villard, *Up to the Light, The Story of French Protestantism in Canada* (Toronto, 1928), pp. 36-52, 92-106. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*pp. 222-223. J. W. Grant, "The Church and Canada's Self Awareness," *Canadian Journal of Theology*, XIII, 3 (July, 1967), pp. 198-199.

[15] W. Gregg, *Short History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada*, pp. 168-173, 211-214. P. Villard, *op. cit.*, pp. 51, 85, 94, 98-100, 106-114. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, p. 99.

[16] *British American Presbyterian*, IV, 18 (11 June 1875).

[17] *Presbyterian Year Book and Almanac for the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland*, ed. James Cameron (Toronto, 1876), pp. 63-64.

[18] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1875)*, p. 5.

[19] Facts and figures are based upon Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1875-1910)*. The figures are of necessity approximations.

[20] *Ibid. (1875)*, p. 19

[21] *Ibid. (1876)*, pp. 70-71.

[22] *Ibid. (1877)*, p. 50; *(1878)*, p. 50.

[23] W. L. Grant and F. Hamilton, *op. cit.*

[24] For examples of articles supporting modern scholarship in a journal well regarded by the Presbyterians, see the following *Queen's Quarterly* articles, D. Ross, "A Present Trend," I (1893-94), pp. 12-17; J. A. Sinclair, "Does Historical Criticism Do Violence to

Special Revelation?" I (1893-94), pp. 289-297; G. L. Low, "Evolution in Relation to Christian Thought," IV (1898-99), pp. 85-87.

[25] R. E. Thompson, *A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States* (New York, 1895), pp. 261-273. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, p. 59.

[26] *Canadian Christian Examiner and Presbyterian Review*, "Report of a Committee of the Presbytery of Toronto on the Subject of a Theological Seminary," (May, 1838), pp. 135-138.

[27] *Ibid.*, "Ecclesiastical Intelligence," (July, 1839), pp. 225-226.

[28] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

[29] *The Presbyterian: A Missionary and Religious Record of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland* (September, 1854), pp. 141-142.

[30] W. Gregg, *Short History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada*, pp. 55-65, 116-119. W. L. Grant and F. Hamilton, *op. cit.*pp. 189-203. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 27, 76-77.

[31] *The Presbyterian: A Missionary and Religious Record of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland* (November, 1862), p. 320; (December, 1862), pp. 348-352; (September, 1865), p. 306.

[32] W. Gregg, *Short History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada*, pp. 119-120. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, p. 74.

[33] W. L. Grant and F. Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-70.

[34] *The Home and Foreign Record of the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces of British North America*, "Historical Sketch and Statistics of the Free Church," (August, 1874), pp. 217-218. W. Gregg, *Short History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada*, pp. 31, 83-84, 100, 106-107. R. Murray, "Presbyterianism in the Sea Provinces: An Historical Sketch, *Westminster*, new series VIII, 21 (26 May 1900), pp. 629-632. J. A. MacGlasken, "The Change of a Hundred Years: Centenary of the Presbyterian College, Pine Hill," *Presbyterian and Westminster*, new series VIII, 15 (7 October 1920), pp. 387-389. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 71-73. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 154-156.

[35] J. A. MacGlasken, *op. cit.*, pp. 387-389.

[36] Canada Presbyterian Church, *Minutes of the Synod (1861)*, pp. 9-14, 41, 52.

[37] *The Home and Foreign Record of the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces of British North America* (November, 1875), pp. 306-308. For a very detailed description of the occasion and the facilities see *British American Presbyterian*, IV, 36 (15 October 1875), pp. 1, 5.

[38] W. Gregg, *Short History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada*, pp. 132-135, 160-162. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 78-80. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

[39] Canada Presbyterian Church, *Minutes of the Synod (1864)*, pp. 22, 25, 28, 29, 45; (*1865*), pp. 21, 38, 39-40, appendices XII; (*1866*), p. 55; (*1867*), pp. 20-21, 36, 38-39, 45-46, 48-49.

[40] *Ibid (1869)*, pp. 41-42.

[41] *The Presbyterian Church: A Missionary and Religious Record of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland* (November, 1873), p. 268.

[42] *Ibid*,(December, 1870), p. 285.

[43] Canada Presbyterian Church, *Minutes of the General Assembly (1872)*, pp. 30, 54-55; (*1873*), pp. 69, 70-73; (*1874*) pp. Appendices 85-88; (*1875*), pp. 36, 38, Appendices 187-190. C. Gregg, *Short History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada*, pp. 179-181. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 81-82. R. C. MacBeth, "The Story of Manitoba College," *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXIV, 41 (November, 1921), pp. 8-10.

[44] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1876)*, p. 5

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[46] *Ibid. (1876)*, pp. 66-67.

[47] *Ibid. (1877)*, p. 37; (*1878*), pp. 47-48; (*1881*), pp. 43-44.

[48] *Ibid. (1878)*, p. 35; (*1879*), p. 50.

[49] *Ibid. (1881)*, pp. 43-44; *(1886)*, pp. 19, 26, 29, 33.

[50] W. L. Grant and F. Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 279-294, 313-346, 421-434. J. Watson, "Thirty Years in the History of Queen's University," *Q. Q.*, X, 2 (1902-03), pp. 188-196. W. G. Jorden, "Queen's and the Church," *Q.Q.*, XVI, 3 (1909-10), pp. 258-260.

[51] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1876)*, p. 19, *(1879)*, p. 52, Appendices CCXXXIV-CCXXXV.

[52] *Ibid. (1887)*, p. 40; *(1888)*, pp. 24, 42; *(1889)*, p. 66.

[53] *Ibid. (1880)*, pp. 23, 30.

[54] *Ibid. (1898)*, pp. 26-27, 47-48.

[55] *Ibid. (1875)*, p. 5.

[56] *Ibid. (1877)*, p. 37; *(1879)*, pp. 36-40; *(1880)*, p. 49. W. Gregg, *Short History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada*, pp. 202, 204.

[57] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1884)*, pp. 24, 26.

[58] *Ibid. (1885)*, pp. 28, 34-35, 46-47; *(1886)*, pp. 18-19, 24.

[59] *Ibid. (1893)*, pp. 30, 37, 39-41; *(1894)*, pp. 24, 53-54, 58.

[60] *Ibid. (1904)*, p. 31; *The Presbyterian* (18 June 1904), p. 788.

[61] W. Gregg, *Short History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada*, pp. 201-202.

[62] *Westminster*, new series VIII, 25 (23 June 1900), p. 728.

[63] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1910)*, pp. Appendices 494, 500.

[64] *Ibid. (1876)*, p. Appendices 117.

[65] *Ibid. (1910)*, pp. Appendices 494, 535-609.

[66] *Ibid. (1876)*, p. Appendices 117.

[67] For a biography see C. W. Gordon, *op. cit.*

[68] *Ibid.*, pp. 202-245, 329-378. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, p. 105.

[69] C. W. Gordon, *The Life of James Robertson, D.D.*, pp. 178-201.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 266.

[71] *Ibid.*, pp. 261, 279, 398.

[72] *Westminster*, new series VIII, 15 (April, 1900), p. 428.

[73] *Ibid.*, 21 (26 May 1900), pp. 594-595.

[74] A. McLeod, "The Church and the Man," *Q.Q.*, XIII (1905-06), pp. 48-58.

[75] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-127. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 245-254. G. C. Pidgeon, *The United Church of Canada: The Story of Union* (Toronto, 1950), pp. 27-33.

[76] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1910)*, pp. 85-86.

[77] *Ibid. (1911)*, pp. 43, Appendices 288-291; *(1912)*, pp. 56, 66, 71, Appendices 337-339.

[78] *The Presbyterian*, new series XXVIII, 17(27 April, 1916), p. 387.

[79] *Ibid.*, 30 (29 June 1916), pp. 624-625.

[80] A. G. Sinclair, "The Union Situation," *The Presbyterian*, new series XXVIII, 5 (February 3, 1916), pp. 107-108.

[81] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1916)*, pp. 68-69.

[82] *The Presbyterian and Westminster*, new series IV, 12 (26 September 1918), p. 286.

[83] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1922)*, pp. Appendices 289-293.

[84] *Ibid. (1920)*, p. 78.

[85] *Ibid. (1921)*, pp. 60-61.

[86] *Ibid. (1922)*, p. 113.

[87] *Ibid. (1920)*, p. Appendices 278.

[88] *Ibid. (1921)*, pp. 60-73.

[89] *Ibid. (1922)*, pp. 76-83.

[90] *Ibid. (1923)*, pp. 102-103.

[91] *Ibid. (1918)*, pp. 85-93.

[92] *Ibid. (1921)*, pp. 69, 189-190; *(1922)*, pp. 26, 102.

[93] *Ibid. (1923)*, pp. 98, Appendices 212, 620.

[94] *Ibid. (1924)*, pp. 66, 71, 254.

[95] *The Westminster*, VIII, 6 (February, 1900), p. 163.

[96] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1912)*, pp. 33, 45-47.

[97] *Ibid. (1925)*, pp. Appendices 143-185. Methodist Church, *Journal of the Methodist General Conference (1922)*, pp. 211-212.

[98] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1921)*, pp. 68-69; *(1922)*, pp. 81-82.

[99] *Ibid. (1911)*, pp. Appendices 288-289.

[100] *Ibid. (1911)*, p. 43;*(1913)*, pp. 71, Appendices 318.

[101] *Ibid. (1913)*, pp. 91, Appendices 318.

[102] *Ibid. (1918)*, pp. 85-86, 92, 93.

[103] *Ibid. (1920)*, pp. Appendices 247-248.

[104] *Presbyterian and Westminster*, new series VII, 22 (27 May 1920), p. 524.

[105] *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXIV, 29 (16 June 1921), p. 14.

[106] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1920)*, p. Appendices 246.

[107] *Ibid.* p. 278.

[108] *Ibid.*, pp. Appendices 236-239.

[109] E. A. Corbett, "Young Canadians and the Ministry," *Presbyterian and Westminster*

[110] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1922)*, pp. appendices 291-293.

[111] *Presbyterian and Westminster*, new series IV, 15 (24 October 1918), p. 375.

[112] Presbyterian Church, Board of Home Missions and Social Service, *Minutes of the Annual Meeting* (1920), p. 49.

[113] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1921)*, pp. Appendices 280-281.

[114] *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXIV, 29 (1921), p. 16.

[115] Figures taken from Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A.*

[116] *Ibid. (1911)*, pp. 43, Appendices 288-291.

[117] *Ibid. (1912)*, pp. 56, 66, 71, Appendices 337-339.

[118] W. G. Jordan, "The Standard of Ministerial Education," *Q.Q.*, XIX (1912-13), pp. 202-213.

[119] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1913)*,

[120] *Ibid. (1914)*, pp. 60-61, 66.

[121] *Ibid. (1916)*, pp. 68-69.

[122] *Ibid. (1917)*, pp. 86, 91; *(1918)*, pp. 91-92; *(1921)*, pp. 60-61.

[123] *Ibid. (1911)*, pp. 43, Appendices 337-339.

[124] *Ibid. (1912)*, pp. 56, 66, 71, Appendices 337-339.

[125] *Ibid. (1913)*, pp. 91, Appendices 317-319.

[126] *Ibid. (1918)*, pp. 75-77, 82-84.

[127] *Ibid. (1920)*, pp. 54, Appendices 307.

[128] *Ibid. (1922)*, pp. 82, 113.

[129] W. Gregg, *Short History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada*, pp. 204-205. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 81-82.

[130] J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, p. 84.

[131] W. Gregg, *Short History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada*, pp. 174-175. J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 102-104.

[132] J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, p. 102.

[133] C. W. Gordon, *op. cit.*,p. 235.

[134] For a biography see C. Mackinnon, *The Life of Principal Oliver* (Toronto, 1936).

[135] E. H. Oliver, "The Problems of Saskatchewan," *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXIV, 28 (9 June 1921), pp. 11-13. For a more detailed analysis of Western problems see E. H. Oliver, *The Winning of the Frontier* (Toronto, 1930), pp. 166-261.

[136] J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925*, pp. 82-84.

[137] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1915)*, pp. Appendices 322-325.

[138] *Ibid.*, pp. 62-64.

[139] *Ibid. (1916)*, pp. 68-69.

[140] *Ibid. (1918)*, pp. Appendices 276-277.

[141] *Ibid.*, pp. 74-77, 82, 83.

[142] *Ibid. (1919)*, p. 97.

[143] W. Murray, "The Colleges and the Church," *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXV, 29 (27 July 1922), p. 9.

[144] W. Murray, "The Problem of the Church Colleges," *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXV, 31 (10 August 1922), p. 10.

[145] Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1925)*, Appendices p. 472.

[146] Estimated from figures in Presbyterian Church, *A.P.G.A. (1925)*, p. Appendices 471.

[147] *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXVII, 46 (13 November 1924), p. 2.

[148] *Ibid.* LXXVIII, 9 (26 February 1925), p. 2.

CHAPTER III

THE METHODIST CHURCH

The formation of the "Methodist Church" in Canada in 1884 ended decades of Methodist disunity and produced an ecclesiastical institution uniquely suited to its ideology.

The initial divisions had been caused by the competitive activities of the missionaries sent by the English and American Methodist Conferences at the request of Methodist immigrants to British North America.[1] The American type of advantages of experience in frontier conditions and their more sectarian message passed as living conditions improved, immigration from Britain increased, and the Canadians became more nationalistic in the post War of 1812 period. Various modes of accommodation were attempted but all failed, so the connection between the Canadian work and the American Methodist Conference was severed in 1828. This, too, failed to end the competition but the struggle was now between British and Canadian Methodism. It was at this point, 1829, that the Canadians opened the Cobourg educational institution in order to prepare ministers for their pulpits. Ideologically the contest had changed from between American sectarianism and British social reformism to one between Canadian social reformism and British conservatism.

In order to end the scandal of competition, a union was arranged in 1833 under the name of the "Wesleyan Methodist Church in British North America." The terms constituted a virtual capitulation of the Canadians to the British position. The British later modified their views in order to heal the disruption of relations during the years 1840-1847 when the Canadians stood firm on the issue of social and religious liberty. Henceforth the mainstream of Canadian Methodism retained a connection with the British Wesleyan Conference until 1874 when a new sense of nationalism in Canada led to a more national and independent organization.

The Union of 1833 had not ended Methodist disunity in British North America. Indeed, the union itself had produced a splinter body, issues appeared from time to time which produced others, and still more were created by splinter Methodist bodies in Britain extending their activities to British North America. None of these ever seriously rivalled the main body in terms of size or influence and they all acquired a sectarian quality.

In contrast to this fragmentation, there were several unions of which that of 1833 was the first. In 1854 this body united with one in Lower Canada which enjoyed a similar relationship with the English Methodist Conference. Unions also occurred in 1837 and 1843 among some of the splinter groups. At the time of Confederation there were six churches in Canada holding to the Methodist tradition: the Primitive Methodist, Bible Christian, Methodist Episcopal, Methodist New Connexion, and two (Maritime and central Canadian) Wesleyan Methodist Churches.[2] Confederation sparked interest in further union as it was apparent that the problems and opportunities of the future could not be met by Methodism in a condition of disunity.

In 1874 the two Wesleyan Methodist Churches and the Methodist New Connexion merged to form the "Methodist Church of Canada." The Wesleyan heritage was obvious in the organization adopted by the union, while the New Connexion influence was reflected in the admission of laymen to all levels of its courts. To counter the problem of distance, the union adopted the American practice of quadrennial General Conferences to consider matters affecting the whole church, while leaving regional matters to the Annual Conferences. The strong sense of nationalism that moved within the union was reflected in its chosen name, in the insistence that this was not to be a mere branch of some foreign ecclesiastical body, and in the choice of Egerton Ryerson as its first president. Thirty-five years earlier Ryerson had emerged as the champion of opposition to the Clergy Reserves and had sparked the rupture between Upper Canadian and British Methodism. Subsequently he had served as Superintendent of Schools in Canada West, in which office he had distinguished himself through his creative approach and his defense of Protestant rights. By their actions the Methodists closely identified themselves with the nation and served notice that they considered matters both sacred and secular within their scope of interest.[3]

At the time no one was unduly concerned by the absence of other potential parties to Methodist union. The Methodist Episcopal Church felt it was protecting the idea of a second and higher order of clergy, while the Bible Christians and Primitive Methodists prided themselves in standing for the importance of the laity in the courts of the church and all three felt a sense of "special mission." On the other hand the Methodist Church of Canada smugly assumed it had the organization and resources of men and money for the tasks ahead. Subsequently all parties were forced to reconsider their positions: the three small bodies found themselves in serious decline as they were unable to move with the shifting population in the east or to extend themselves into the West, while the Methodist Church of Canada found itself with adequate resources of men and money but also with a polity having inherent weaknesses. An officer was needed who could bridge the gaps between departments within the church and whose extended term of office would enable him to gain influence both in the church and in the wider community.[4] Against these cold realities stood years of carefully conditioned denominational loyalties made necessary by the lack of significant theological differences. Indeed, all four parties sent delegates to the 1881 Methodist Ecumenical Conference in London[5] and thereafter there were elements in each openly advocating a complete union of Canadian Methodism. These efforts were crowned with success in 1883.

This event was unique for, while Methodist bodies from all parts of the world had attended the 1881 Conference, it was only in Canada that union at the national level occurred in the immediately succeeding years. British Methodism lacked the challenge of a frontier and the great rural to urban shift had occurred decades earlier. Union would come to British Methodism but only after the traumatic experiences of the Great War and the Great Depression.[6] American Methodism faced the challenges of a frontier and shifting population but it lacked the sense of a national mission and it had deeply ingrained differences of views on race and organization. It would have to wait until 1939 before even partial union could be effected.[7]

The lack of theological issues enabled the parties to the union in Canada to adopt as its "Doctrinal Basis" in the 1883 "Basis of Union"[8] the portion of the 1879 *Book of Discipline* of the Methodist Church of Canada "referring to the General Rules, Ordinances, Reception of Members, and Means of Grace." Organizationally it adopted a quadrennial "General Conference," regional "Annual Conferences," and "Quarterly District Meetings" which had been characteristic of both the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Church of Canada. Inclusion of both clergy and laity in all the courts of the church departed from the Methodist Episcopal practice of excluding laymen from the upper courts and the Bible Christian and Primitive Methodist practices of excluding the clergy. The exceptions to equal participation will be noted later. The Bible Christians were also required to sacrifice their practice of ordaining women which dated back to their arrival in 1832. Indeed the Methodist Church would exclude women from its ministry, courts, and boards until 1922 when they would receive equal standing with men save in regard to the ministry and the Stationing Committee.[9] All deferred to the Methodist Episcopal practice of a second and higher order of clergy. This was comparatively painless as it was widely felt that such would remedy the chief defect in the polity of the Methodist Church of Canada. This new order of "Superintendents" carried the same responsibilities as had the Methodist

Episcopal "bishops" but under a title that aroused no resentment in the other parties to the union. These officers would be elected by the General Conference to four year terms of office.[10]

The terms of union were protected by the following,

> No change shall be made in the Basis of Union, affecting constitutional questions, or the rights and privileges of Ministry or Laity, except by a three-fourths majority of the General Conference, and, if required by either order of Ministry or Laity, a two-thirds majority of each order, voting separately.[11]

Change would indeed be possible, but only with very wide concurrence throughout the church. With this organization and safeguard, the Methodists entered their "national" period.

In short order events served to cast the essential character of the Methodist Church in sharp relief. The militant nature of Methodism showed itself in the strong support it afforded the Alliance movement as a buttress against Roman Catholic influence in eastern Canada. This quality allied with boundless loyalty to the English language and Anglo-Saxon institutions reflected itself in the strong support given the Dominion Government in the suppression of the Northwest Rebellion in 1885.[12] This latter quality also led to the termination in 1894 of eight years of union negotiations between the Methodists and the Evangelical Association.[13] This German-speaking body shared common religious views and practices with the Methodists but regarded union with them as tantamount to a cultural and linguistic surrender. Ideologically the Methodists were so committed to reformism that they rejected the 1886 union overtures of the more conservative Anglicans despite their common language and culture.[14]

The parties to the 1884 Methodist union claimed 157,752 full members and 1,184 active ministers (Methodist Church of Canada, 120,369 and 875; Methodist Episcopal Church, 23,788 and 189; Bible Christian Church, 6,677 and 64; Primitive Methodist, 6,918 and 56).[15] During its "national" period, the General Conference statistics would record a growth in membership from 157,752 to 375,860 and in the ministry from 1,184 to 1,542.[16] In 1884 they listed congregations in all the provinces and territories, and mission stations in Japan. By 1925 the Canadian work was greatly expanded and a strong missionary effort in China had been added.[17]

Consideration of the policies of "united" Methodism will be divided into pre- and post-1910 periods.

I. METHODIST POLICIES (1883-1910)

As in the previous chapter, the areas of the Ministry and the Colleges will be considered.

The Ministry

The 1883 "Basis of Union" outlined in detail the duties and place of ministers within the church but said nothing of their required character. Of the various ranks within the church (General Superintendent, Minister, Probationer, Candidate for the Ministry, Class Leader, Church Member, and Society Member) only in reference to the last and lowest rank was there any discussion of character.[18] In effect, character requirements were uniform for all ranks and status was dependent upon function.

The basic requirement was "'a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from . . . [the punishment of] sins.' But wherever this is really fixed in the soul, it will be shewn by its fruits." These "fruits" were then outlined in detail under three headings. First, "by doing no harm, by avoiding evil of every kind, especially that which is generally practiced," one should avoid profanity, drunkenness, slave trading, fighting, smuggling, usury, gossip, ostentatious dress, self indulgence, greed, and unethical business practice. Second, "by doing good" one should be "kind and merciful . . . to all men" by way of providing those in need with food, clothing, medicine and/or sympathy; by serving the souls of others through instruction, reproof, and exhortation; and finally, one should live in a manner to "credit" the Gospel. Third, "by attending upon all the ordinances of God," one should participate in public worship, the "ministry of the word, either read or expounded," the Lord's Supper, family and private prayer, study of the Scriptures, and fasting and abstinence. Failure to meet these requirements was grounds for expulsion from the Church. Stringent requirements they were, indeed, but they remained in theory if not always in practice throughout the period of united Methodism.

The ministry of the Methodist Church would initially consist of the ministers of the churches joining the union,

> All preachers who have received ordination in any of the uniting bodies, and are in good standing at the time of the Union, shall retain all rights and privileges conferred by such ordination.

and future ordinations were provided for in that

> Each Annual Conference shall have authority to elect into full connexion and ordain any Probationer within its bounds who has

> travelled four years and fulfilled all disciplinary requirements. Also, to elect and ordain Probationers of less than four years' standing when the necessities of the work require it.[19]

Placement of ministers in pastoral work was assigned to the "Stationing Committees" of the Annual Conferences. These were composed of the President of the Conference, District Superintendents, and one minister from each District.[20] In like manner only ministers were permitted to vote on the admission of men to the ministry, their retirement, or to participate in disciplinary investigations of ministers.[21] In effect, ministers were primarily agents of the Conference and responsible to the clerical element thereof. Such had been characteristic of both the Methodist Church of Canada and the Methodist Episcopal Church, but it was the latter that had made it a condition of union.[22]

Other matters, of course, would arise regarding the ministry but these would be settled by the General Conference using its power "to make rules and regulations for the entire Church."[23]

This power was used by the first General Conference to establish a procedure by which ministers could be transferred between Conferences, and to provide a "Court of Appeal" composed of six ministerial and six lay members presided over by a General Superintendent to review decisions made by boards or courts of the church at the request of persons who felt injured by the decision in question.[24] Such a court was unknown elsewhere in Methodism.[25] Of more general interest was the adoption of the "Itinerant Ministry." Methodism, from its beginning in England, had regularly moved its ministers to new "circuits" or "stations." Such had resulted in a fairly equitable distribution of ministerial talent over a period of time and prevented the ministers from transferring their primary loyalty from the Conference to the congregations which they served. In all branches of Methodism there appeared a tendency to lengthen the terms of appointment as the level of education among the ministers rose. The Canadian General Conference of 1883 adopted the system with these features: all ministers and probationers, save General Conference officers, superannuated or supernumerary ministers, and workers in educational institutions or missions to the French or Indians, would not remain in the same posting for more than three years, nor would anyone be allowed to return to a previous appointment after less than a six year interval.[26]

The arrangements so far discussed were not universally approved. The clerical monopoly of the Stationing Committee was attacked in the General Conferences of 1886, 1890, and 1894 by laymen professing a desire to increase its efficiency. In actual fact many perceived that the monopoly could be employed by the clergy to reward or chasten with impunity its own members or a congregation. The clergy offered no counter arguments because the monopoly fell under the safeguard given to the "Basis of Union" and the laity were too wise to call for a divided vote which they could not hope to win.[27]

Greater success attended efforts to change the pastoral term as this fell beyond the scope of the "Basis of Union" safeguard. Every General Conference during the period 1886 to 1906 was urged to lengthen the pastoral term or to abolish the time limit.[28] During the early years the proposals were rejected on the argument that the results would be exhausted ministers or the encouragement of lazy or unscrupulous men to seek easy appointments with the intention of long tenure.[29] In 1894 the General Conference conceded the extensions of an appointment to four or five years if three-fourths of the Stationing Committee agreed that such was in the interest of the work ". . . in cities and towns [where] the short pastoral term prevented ministers acquiring the influence that a longer term would give them."[30] This was both an admission of the Methodist interest in expanding its influence and an indication of growing urban influence in Methodist polity decisions. In 1902 the General Conference extended the normal appointment period from three to four years and reduced the interval between appointments to the same charge from six to four years. Beyond this the General Conference refused to go nor would it consider any suggestion, as had been made in 1890, that the Quarterly Boards be empowered to shorten a pastoral term or have a voice in the selection of ministers.[31]

The period closed with a growing pressure for a settled rather than itinerant ministry and for lay participation in the appointment of ministers.

The Colleges

So different was the nature of Methodism from that of Presbyterianism and Congregationalism that its college policies will be considered in the order of Church-College Relations, Finance, Student Recruitment, and Curriculum.

The 1883 "Basis of Union" placed the colleges in a clearly subordinate relationship to the church.

> It is recommended that the United [Methodist] Church adhere to the traditional policy . . . that our colleges should be under the fostering care of the Church.[32]

Such was in keeping with the Methodist practice of preparing men for ordination through a program of work experience and study, the latter of which was undertaken in the field or at a college at the direction of Conference.[33] This arrangement enabled the Methodists to avoid many of the problems encountered by the Presbyterians with their semi-autonomous colleges, and, as will be seen in the next chapter, by the Congregationalists with their autonomous colleges.

Methodism, it will be recalled, drew no distinctions, save that of function, between the clergy and laity and was generally reformist in its ideology. The educational implication of this was that wherever it was apparent that an institution of learning was needed and resources were available, a school, college, or university was provided. Thus in 1883 the Methodists were active in education in a variety of ways and places. In Newfoundland they were cooperating with the government in the grade school system, which had a denominational organization, and were operating a teachers' college which had been opened in 1862. In New Brunswick the complex at Sackville, founded in 1840, provided upper grade education for boys and girls and offered university work in Arts and Theology. In Quebec a grade school for French speaking children was operated in Montreal, upper grade academies for boys and girls were provided in Stanstead, and a theological college, founded in 1873, was in operation in Montreal. All the aforementioned were under the direction of the Methodist Church of Canada which was also active in Ontario in operating ladies' colleges at Whitby (founded in 1874) and Hamilton (founded in 1861), and a university at Cobourg, founded in 1829, which had grown to include faculties of Arts, Law, Medicine, and Theology. The Methodist Episcopal Church was active in Ontario, operating a ladies' college at St. Thomas (founded in 1877) and a complex, founded in 1857, at Belleville which offered upper grades to boys and girls and university work in Arts and Theology. Both these churches were interested in undertaking educational work in Manitoba but neither had progressed beyond the obtaining of charters and some initial, but rather ineffective, fund raising activity.[34] Henceforth attention will be focussed upon the institutions engaged in the training of ministers.

To smooth the entry of these institutions into the Union, the 1883 General Conference retained their existing Boards of Management until the 1886 General Conference meeting. It also established an Educational Society, like that of the old Methodist Church of Canada, to gather and administer funds for the aid of the colleges and probationers and to oversee affairs during the intervals between General Conference meetings. Finally, to reduce duplication of effort, commissioners were appointed to consolidate the work of Victoria University, Cobourg, and Albert College, Belleville; and the work of the, as yet, undeveloped colleges in Manitoba.[35]

The provincial government plan to "confederate" numerous colleges as the "University of Toronto" in Toronto raised the question as to whether the General Conference could consolidate or modify the work of the colleges in relationship with institutions outside the circle of Methodism. The question was studied by the General Conferences of 1886 and 1890 and participation by Victoria University was approved after an unsuccessful attempt by the residents of Cobourg to block the move through a court action. The *Christian Guardian* applauded the General Conference action as providing Methodist students with improved education at reduced cost. As it was, the move required two years to complete.[36] Methodism thus moved with the tide of metropolitanism.

Organizational and financial problems prompted the 1886 General Conference to appoint a Secretary of Education. Subsequent reports by this officer indicate that his scope of activities was limited to choosing methods by which General Conference educational policies could be instituted.[37]

Finally, issues arose making it necessary to reaffirm the church-college relationship. Efforts in 1894 to provide either the General or Annual Conferences with veto powers over professorial appointments met with no success.[38] In approving the application of Columbian College, New Westminster, to become a "connexional" institution, the 1894 General Conference expressed its disfavour for the way in which the college had been initiated.

> No new educational institution shall be initiated by any of the Church Courts or Boards without the consent of the General Conference or during the period between sessions of that Conference without the consent of the General Conference Special Committee.[39]

Thus the General Conference was prepared neither to assume new powers in college affairs nor to abdicate old rights.

So evident were the inadequacies of the existing organization that the 1906 General Conference adopted the Education Committee recommendation that a Board of Education be formed with the Secretary of Education as its chief officer and with responsibility for the tasks formerly borne by the Secretary. Increased discretion was given the Board regarding financial grants to probationers.[40] In general, the period was one in which the means to make General Conference policies effective were refined rather than one of basic change in the Church-college relationship.

Prior to 1883 Canadian Methodist colleges had been financed with resources from three sources: individual college endowment funds, the result of gifts and bequests; student fees; and yearly appeals which became territorial in character as the numbers of colleges increased. Tendencies to excessive localism were countered by placing a portion of the educational funds of each Conference at the disposal of the Educational Society for disbursement in ways to best serve the whole church. This system was adopted by the Union but the Educational Society was restricted to the assistance of probationers and of colleges offering theological instruction.[41]

College financing was essentially a matter of raising sufficient funds for the task and disbursing them in an efficient and equitable manner. Insufficient funds prompted the 1886 General Conference to appoint a Secretary to promote support through programs of education, preaching, and rallies. By 1890 his success in Ontario, mainly to the benefit of Victoria University, validated the officer and his methods, which were then expanded to tapping the resources of the entire church.[42] The increase in support did not, however, keep pace with demands and the situation was reviewed by the 1898 General Conference and widely publicized through the *Christian Guardian.*[43] This produced results, and the 1902 report to the General Conference noted a 400 per cent increase in collections over 1882[44], but it was increasingly clear that the requirements would not be fully met over a long term by existing methods of fund raising, so the 1906 reorganized Educational Society was charged with the responsibility of finding a new approach.[45] The basis of the problem was actually very simple. In 1883 the Methodists had "recommended" that probationers receive some college training; by 1906 it was their view that, apart from very rare exceptions, all probationers should undergo a minimum of three years of college training. This required expanded facilities, faculties, and student aid at a time when the church was expanding its activities in other spheres. Collectively these activities required money in amounts beyond the capacity of Canadian Methodism to supply.

The disbursement practice adopted by the Methodist Union was to leave one-fourth of the educational funds collected by each Conference for distribution at its own discretion. This often included assistance to probationers. The other three-fourths were distributed to the colleges as follows: Victoria University, 50 per cent; Wesley College, Winnipeg, 18 per cent; Wesley College, Montreal, 18 per cent; and Mount Allison, 14 per cent. No significant funds were carried over from year to year; hence the colleges were unable to rely on Society funds to meet fixed expenses.[46] In addition the system led to glaring inequities in the support extended to probationers from different Conferences, which gave rise to morale problems. While the colleges were left to wrestle with their planning problems, the 1894 General Conference adopted an "Equalization Scheme" to assist the probationers and give credence to the more "connexional" approach of the Educational Society in its fund raising. Henceforth each Conference would retain one-third of the funds collected for education. Of the funds received by the Educational Society, one-third would be used for student grants and loans, the Society's expenses would be taken from the remaining two-thirds and the remainder would, as before, be distributed to the colleges on a percentage basis.[47] By centralizing the assistance to probationers, the most obvious fault of the old approach was corrected. By increasing the amount controlled by the Conference, the membership of the church was further encouraged to support education while the colleges were forced to solicit support actively at the Conference level. This approach to disbursement was retained throughout the period with one minor revision of the percentages in 1898.[48] However, by 1906, the General Conference was calling for further change, as it was evident, especially in regard to probationer assistance, that existing practices were inadequate.[49] This was, in effect, an admission that the expense of the college education required by the Church placed the ministry beyond the means of many suitable men and if such were to receive adequate training, the financial burden would have to be borne by the Church.

Ordination, it will be recalled, was a matter of Conference decision, based upon a probationer's success in meeting certain character, disciplinary, and educational standards, the last of which might involve college attendance if the Conference considered it advisable. Therefore attention must be directed to the broad requirements for ordination rather than to the recruitment of students for the colleges.

The 1883 "Basis of Union" established the responsibilities of the various church courts regarding men preparing for the ministry. Quarterly Circuit Meetings could grant the status of "candidate for the ministry" to suitable applicants and recommend them to the District Meeting. The District Meeting could grant the status of "probationer for the ministry" which permitted the applicant to begin his training. The Annual Conference could elect those who had completed their training into "full connexion" and confer ordination.[50] Apart from an 1883 General Conference decision making Annual Conference Boards of Examiners responsible for inquiry into the "educational acquirements" of probationers,[51] this basic division of responsibilities was retained despite repeated efforts to have a General Conference Board of Examiners created to assume this task.[52] Such centralization was considered too high a price for uniformity.

The primary intention was to prevent the entry of unsuitable persons into the ministry. The Circuit Meeting recommended for "candidate for the ministry" only those who had been church members for one year, a "local preacher in good standing" for six months, and, save in the rarest of cases, unmarried. Candidates for the ministry became probationers after satisfying the District Superintendent

> respecting their health, piety, moral character, ministerial abilities, and educational acquirements, belief of our doctrines, attachment to our Discipline, and freedom from debt, as well as from all secular encumbrances.[53]

Thereafter probationers were required to appear before the annual District Meeting to submit a certificate from the Conference Board of Examiners indicating completion of the year's course of study as prescribed by the General Conference, to be questioned on their reading for the coming year, and to be questioned regarding their pastoral work, theological views, and personal habits. If a probationer survived four years of service and examination, the District Meeting would recommend him to the Conference which, after further examination, would receive him into "full connexion" and confer ordination.[54]

College attendance as a prerequisite for ordination was not even mentioned. Such a requirement had no precedent in any of the churches party to the union, despite the fact that two of the parties had long possessed colleges and one had a long tradition of liberal-reformist ideology. While the union was the achievement of those holding liberal-reformist views, it was not politic to insist upon college attendance as a prerequisite for ordination lest this appear as a criticism of ministers who had not been to college. Those favouring college education had to be content for the moment with the General Conference position "that it shall be required, as far as possible, that every probationer for our ministry shall avail himself of the advantages of a theological training in our schools."[55] This presented the problem of harmonizing this with the requirements previously adopted.

The 1886 General Conference ruled that probationers who, before or during probation, had completed degrees in Arts and Theology could be ordained after two years of supervised field work if evidence was produced that six months had been spent in circuit work during the summers of their college years. Men with a degree in Arts, by completing two years of the prescribed course in one year, could reduce their probation to three years.[56] College education was thus established as a reason for shortening the circuit work requirement. Programs undertaken by men with degrees were henceforth referred to as "Special Courses" while the original program was designated the "Ordinary Course." By 1894 innumerable "misunderstandings and mistakes in administration" had occurred, and a restatement of policy was felt necessary. "Special Course" men with the degrees B.A. and B.D. were to spend four years on probation, two in college and two in circuit work. Men with the degree B.A. had similar obligations but one of the college years had to be devoted to theological studies. The Conferences could grant credit for one year of probation at college prior to formal reception of a candidate as a probationer if they so desired. Men with the degree M.D. and intentions of medical missionary service were treated like those with the B.A. degree.[57] The "Special Courses" remained thus until 1906 when the B.A. men became required to spend two college years in theological study and a separate three year course was arranged for medical missionaries.[58]

The "Ordinary Course" revision of 1886 directed all probationers, unless they could justify not doing so to their Conferences, to spend two years at college during which the minimum expectation would be the completion of the Prescribed Course for those years.[59] College attendance thus was given a cooperative rather than competitive relationship with the Prescribed Course. The major program revision of 1894 expanded the "Ordinary Course" probation to five years, three in circuit work followed by two at college unless otherwise specifically ordered by the Annual Conference.[60] College training, earlier limited to a privileged few, had become a prerequisite for ordination. The *Christian Guardian* justified the change in these terms,

> The elevation of the educational standard of admission for candidates for the ministry is . . . important. The growing intelligence of the people, resulting from greater educational advantages, has made the demand for an educated ministry more imperative. Attendance at college is now made compulsory. . . . Strong fears were expressed that this might shut out men of superior intellectual gifts and fervent piety; but some degree of elasticity is allowed which may prevent the exclusion of such young men. . . .[61]

As the cities and towns were the places where "educational opportunities" were most available, the change was indicative of the concern of the Methodists to meet urban needs. Professionalism had become the mark of the Methodist ministry with a vengeance, and would be furthered in 1906 when probationers in the "Ordinary Course" would be required to spend two years in the circuit followed by three at college.[62]

The 1894 decision in favour of a professional ministry was also reflected in the General Conference repudiation of all connection and sympathy with the work of Ralph Horner. Ordained as a Methodist preacher in 1887, Horner had since been engaged in evangelistic work which had resulted in the growth of a personal following. In general his followers did not establish close or formal ties with the Methodist Church. In the view of the General Conference, one of its ministers was promoting the growth of a competitive force, and hence the repudiation. However this did not bring Horner "to heel," and the next year he was expelled from the ministry. Horner's "Holiness Movement" continued to grow but later lost its identity in the formation of the Standard Church of America and in the Pentecostal movement.[63]

The introduction of the college attendance requirement forced administrative changes. In 1886 the General Conference authorized Boards of Examiners and Special District Meetings within the colleges to serve students absent from their home Conferences and Districts.[64] These proved successful and were retained throughout the period.

While the trend was generally toward longer college training to satisfy urban desires, the continuing needs of the rural areas and especially the West forced a measure of compromise. The 1898 General Conference permitted local preachers to undertake the Prescribed Studies for which they would receive credit should they later become Probationers.[65] In 1902 suitable men began to be recruited as Evangelistic Workers for service in "New Ontario, Manitoba and the Northwest, and British Columbia." Continued employment of these men was dependent upon their success in a program of studies. If such men became Probationers, they became subject to the more stringent studies of the "Ordinary Course" and its other regulations.[66] While the scope of employment for men in these programs was carefully circumscribed, the programs destroyed the distinctive marks of the Probationer. The local preacher could now share in the study program without the burden of circuit work, while the Evangelistic Worker could share the circuit work with a far lighter burden of study. In the broadest sense, however, college training had gained superiority over circuit work as preparation for the ministry, and the colleges were assured of a student body.

However, the hopes of the Union in 1884 that sufficient men would be available to maintain the ministry and to undertake the missionizing of the West were disappointed. In 1906 the General Superintendent, Albert Carman, addressed the General Conference in these terms,

> Nowhere have the invisible elements of the conflict, the spiritual and unseen forces fuller play than in the call, preparation and regular procession of the Christian ministry. We have seen times in Canada when the Methodist Church easily supplied all the men required for her ministry, and times when it was said she had too many ministers or more than could be stationed in her work. We are now seeing times when there is a great lack of men, and when it is found necessary to go abroad to seek supplies and candidates for our ministry. . . . It must, of course, be taken into the account that the almost sudden opening of our North-West Territories and the extraordinary efforts of our government to people them have much to do with the demand on one side while they render no help to the supply on the other. . . .
>
> In the settlement of Ontario, . . . the growth of the church kept pace with the growth of the country, so that native born youth and the normal immigration from the old countries and the United States kept the ministerial ranks well filled. . . . [Now] we are sending to Britain for men. Could we not raise up more and . . . better men of our own? . . .[67]

In its usual dispassionate tones, the Educational Society informed the General Conference that the supply of new ministers would have to be doubled if the work of the Church was not to suffer.[68]

Courses of study of men preparing for the ministry were set by the General Conference largely upon the advice of its Course of Study Committee. This meant that the curriculum was uniform throughout the church and was under regular and intelligent review. The traditional Methodist objective of a highly trained ministry capable of serving in any office of the church with the possible exception of the highly specialized professorial chairs was adopted by the union without question. As the Methodists moved toward a more professional ministry, they modified their curriculum accordingly.

The 1883 "Prescribed Course of Studies" included a "Preliminary Course" upon which Candidates were examined prior to becoming Probationers for the Ministry. It consisted of an "English Branch" (English Grammar and Composition, Arithmetic, and Geography), a "History Branch" (Ancient, English, and New Testament) and a "Theology Branch" (selected works by John Wesley and the Methodist Catechism). This course recognized the limited educational background of some candidates and served to ascertain whether such men had the capacity and incentive to further their education while providing them with some measure of preparation for circuit work. Candidates possessing university matriculation or a teaching certificate were excused from examination in the "English Branch."[69] The 1894 "Preliminary Course" reflected a heavy reliance upon secular agencies and vastly greater expectations of the candidates. Candidates were expected to have "matriculation (with the Greek option) into a British or Canadian University" and would write examinations in the "Theology Branch." Non-matriculants, with the recommendations of a District Meeting and a Board of Examiners, and with the approval of two-thirds of an Annual Conference, were permitted to take examinations in the "Theology Branch," Arithmetic, English Grammar, Composition and Literature, Geography, and Greek.[70] Non-matriculants were, in effect, discouraged from becoming probationers unless they were men of unusual character and gifts.

In discussing the curriculum of the probationary years, the following terms will be used: "Biblical Studies," referring to courses directly concerned with Scripture; "Theology," referring to the systematic expression of Christian belief; "Church History," referring to the development of the Church; "Practical Theology," referring to courses related to the ministerial functions of preacher, teacher, pastor, and administrator; and "Secular Studies" to such as would be taken by persons not specifically intending to fill the ministerial office.

The 1883 four year Probationers' "Ordinary Course"[71] placed heavy emphasis upon New Testament Biblical Studies and Theology. Of sixteen courses, five were Biblical Studies and four were Theology. Circuit Preaching responsibilities provided practical experience in preaching skills. The college program, while differently organized and devoting 20 rather than 12½ per cent of its time to secular studies, had the same emphasis. These and subsequent programs, in keeping with the Methodist emphasis on "Grace," placed far greater stress upon the New Testament than the Old. As urban influence increased in Methodism, so did the importance attached to the pulpit function of the ministers. The 1890 General Conference increased the course of studies with a course in English literature, three in preaching, and four in English Bible.[72]

The 1894 course revision[73] was clearly a victory for those committed to a college trained professional ministry. Probation was increased from four to five years, the first three in circuit work and the last two in college. Courses taken during the circuit years were designed as preparation for those later taken in college. New Testament Biblical Studies and Theology still dominated, but increased time was devoted to Secular Studies in which the courses in philosophy were added to by courses in psychology and political science. Christian Education courses were added in Pastoral Theology, formerly a matter of preaching and church administration. The overall trend was toward a more professional ministry capable of communicating with a more educated and secular community. The rationale behind the new program, as presented to the General Conference by J. Elliott, was subsequently published in *Queen's Quarterly*.[74] In substance it was a call for a liberal approach to the education of the ministers. Such would provide the basis for the optimum intellectual development and preparation for solving the variety of problems confronting the ministry in its work which Elliott saw as extending to the reordering upon Christian principles of all human society.

> The minister needs to be a man who can touch the pulse of the world's thought at the right time and in the right direction for the world's good. He is to stimulate and guide its thinking. He must have been trained to think himself. The minister needs to be a man who can exorcise passion, pride, envy, hate and

> selfishness from human hearts . . . . I would, then, reiterate the fact that knowledge is power. It is power to the nation, it is power to the Church, it is power to the individual. Power has ever fallen, power is now falling, power will forever fall into the hands of those who have brains that can think and hearts that can feel for the rest. . . . The Church needs today, the world needs today, thoroughly developed men everywhere. The interests of the race demand most thoroughly developed men in the Christian pulpits. . . . Every young minister should have the privilege of a college course. . . .

In the following years there were repeated demands that the curriculum be further expanded and refined.

> It is ordered that the education of every minister shall be chiefly theological. He must know . . . the facts and truths relating to Christ and the Scriptures. . . . He is little use if he knows not the urgent needs of men. The better he knows . . . literature, . . . science and history, the better will he know God. No study is irrelevant. . . . Our colleges are not perfect. They could be improved; 1. Church history should be brought more into the foreground . . . [in terms] of the present needs of the Church. 2. The science of sociology is one in which every future minister should receive training at college. 3. Every minister should . . . precede his theological course with one in arts. . . .[75]

Adjustments in the language requirement were permitted for probationers intending to work with specific ethnic groups and for probationers of ethnic background. The former were excused from Greek in order to study the language of their future parishioners; the latter took their whole program in their native language. The languages involved were French, Chinese, Japanese, and several native Indian languages.[76] The flaw in this was the lack of consideration given to cultural differences and to the limited educational opportunity in the background of the ethnic probationers, and most found it extremely difficult to meet the educational standards required by the church.

Throughout the period the "Special Courses" for men with degrees included character examinations and circuit work requirements considered equivalent to the "Ordinary Course." Course requirements for these probationers varied according to their educational backgrounds but were generally intended to provide a balance of secular and religious knowledge.[77] The most radical change occurred in the medical missionary program in 1906.[78] The new three year program of fifteen courses emphasized Biblical Studies and the history and theology of missions, but in its scope and depth was a pale shadow of any program previously required of any category of probationer.

All the curricular changes were intended to better prepare the probationers for their work. The "Ordinary Course" was stiffened with secular studies to prepare men to meet the non-church community; the "Special Courses" were enriched with religious studies to make university men more palatable to the congregations they would serve, and medical missionaries were supplied with a rationale for their work. However widespread dissatisfaction in the church led the 1906 General Conference to include curriculum among the items for reappraisal by the Education Committee.[79]

These, then, were the Methodist policies regarding the Ministry and the Colleges in the pre-1910 period. For the most part they were developed in the 1884-1894 years as Canadian Methodism moved from a sect to a church form. Thereafter changes were generally in the form of refinements in this process or grudging concessions to meet overpowering necessities of the moment.

II. METHODIST POLICIES (1910-1925)

During this period the Methodists were forced to modify their policies regarding the ministry and the colleges in order to meet vastly changed conditions and a new attitude within the church. Moreover the period began with the appearance of an issue that threatened the unity of the church itself. Before considering the policy changes, it is necessary to examine the conditions that made them necessary.

Methodist objectives regarding the ministry had been three-fold. There was a consistent effort to maintain a high standard of character and the absence of complaints in the church press and records reflects their success in this area. Second, the Methodists sought to minister to the whole nation. During the early years this took the form of temperance activities, Sabbatarianism, and the maintenance of Anglo-Saxon institutions and the English language. During the late 1890's and early twentieth century this took a more positive form. Henceforth the Methodists would attempt to provide leadership in developing new institutions and evolving national policy. This would require reorganization in order to tap the talent and financial resources of the laity, and the restructuring of education for the ministry to prepare men to assume their new role and to work in harmony with the laity in the conduct of the church's life.[80] Finally, the Methodists were anxious to train sufficient men to serve the needs of the church. In this regard they appeared fairly successful. In the period 1886-1906 the average number of members per Methodist minister changed from 121 to 140, an increase of less than one member per minister per year. In comparison, the average number of members per Presbyterian minister changed between 1875 and 1910 from 140.7 to 257.1, an increase of 3.3 persons per minister per year, or more than triple the rate of increase experienced by Methodism. Regionally the ratios of minister/members in Methodism in 1906 were 1/124.8 in the Maritimes, 1/168.3 in the central provinces, and 1/75 in the four western provinces.[81] As in the case of Presbyterianism, this last ratio is misleading. It is based upon the number of ministers and the number of members in the organized circuits. It does not take into account the large number of Methodists living in areas outside the organized circuits. Distances alone made it imperative that the number of ministers be increased and the Western conditions required that they be men of unusual stamina, dedication, and character. The General Conference was continually called upon to satisfy these needs. As a factor promoting change, the Western situation deserves careful examination.

Methodist work was begun in 1840 by four missionaries from the British Methodist Conference. The early association of the work with the Hudson's Bay Company which made its facilities available to the missionaries soon ended as their Sabbatarian and temperance views clashed with company policies. In 1853 the work passed to Canadian direction but was not expanded until 1858 when four additional workers were sent to British Columbia. A Superintendent of Missions was appointed in 1868 to supervise the work west of Ontario. Despite the changing population, the first Superintendent, George Young, maintained the Indian emphasis in the work until his retirement in

1885.[82] The Methodist Union of 1884 envisaged a wider scope of activity and had so expressed it in an "Address to the Methodist People."

> The present time is very opportune for the cessation of the waste of men and means through the divisions of Methodism. Vast areas of our country are being thrown open for settlement; an ever swelling tide of immigration from the older provinces and from the crowded countries of the Old World is bringing a vast population to the virgin areas of our great North-West. It is an hour of highest privilege and duty. We are laying the foundations of empire in righteousness and truth. We are moulding the institutions of the future; we are shaping the destiny of the country. The heralds of the Cross must follow the adventurous pioneer to the remotest settlement of the Saskatchewan, the Qu'appelle and the Peace River, and the vast regions beyond. This we can do as a united Church with far greater efficiency and success than we ever could as separate organizations.[83]

The Methodist policy of introducing the usual district and conference organization whenever possible resulted in the creation of several districts and the "Annual Conference of Manitoba and the North-West" prior to the Union and the "Annual Conference of British Columbia" in 1886. However, vast areas of work within these conferences were still at the mission stage and the responsibility of Young's successor, James Woodsworth.[84]

The trend away from the Indian emphasis began at this time. During the years 1886 to 1890 Indian church membership increased 130 per cent, while white membership in the West increased 207 per cent.[85] Woodsworth was unable to find sufficient numbers of white ministers with the necessary temperaments and attitudes for the work and it became increasingly rare for Indians to meet the requirements for ordination.[86] By 1925 there were still only thirty-four centers of Indian work in the four Western provinces serving 9,171 members.[87] Meanwhile growth in the white work led to the formation of the

Saskatchewan and Alberta Conferences in 1910, while mission work expansion had resulted in appointment of two additional Superintendents in 1902.[88]

The basic problem raised by the West was that of finding sufficient numbers of men with suitable qualities. Everyone recognized the need for more men to serve the multitude of points scattered over vast territories; however the East did not comprehend that its policy of producing a more intellectual and professional ministry made many men reluctant to serve in primitive surroundings. Indeed the tendency to regard the East and West as similar reflected itself in the 1906 General Conference refusal to sanction a Methodist paper for the West.[89] The idea of a uniform, well trained ministry met with mixed response in the West. The more urban centers tended to be sympathetic while the people living in frontier conditions and those responsible for supervising the work in such areas desired men with different qualities. Woodsworth was informed on one occasion that the work required men with the "three P's; Pardon, Peace and Purity"; his own view was that missionaries should know less Latin and more "horse."[90]

Woodsworth concentrated his search for men in the colleges in Eastern Canada, and when the response was found insufficient, after 1894 in the British Isles. He was ever conscientious in moderating his concern for numbers by a cautiousness for quality. The supply of men from Britain declined after 1911 as fewer men were entering theological studies and the Methodist churches in South Africa, Australia, and the United States began competitive recruitment campaigns. Woodsworth's seven tours produced 280 men for service in Canada.[91] The *Guardian* editorialized

> The Rev. Dr. Woodsworth [has] returned to Toronto from Britain . . . after about two months' sojourn there securing recruits for the ranks of the Methodist itinerancy in the West. . . . He reports . . . that he succeeded in securing the best of the several companies . . . that he has brought over. There are fifty young men altogether, . . . the majority of them being already at work on their different fields of labor. One-third [are] . . . lay agents, [having done] the usual work of a circuit minister though unordained. The rest were all trained local preachers. . . . This is a kind of immigration that we like to see encouraged though everyone must regret that it is the failure of our own young men to enter . . . the ministry . . . that has occasioned the need. . . .[92]

Despite the care exercised by Woodsworth, his recruitment program was mixed in its results. Singular service was rendered by some recruits while others, through flaws of character or circumstances, did little. A 1924 study of the careers of twenty men recruited in 1912 revealed that four were still engaged in church work while the remainder had entered business, emigrated to the United States, passed to their final reward by reason of illness or war wounds, or, in the case of one, had turned to crime and was in prison.[93] If such attrition was characteristic of other Woodsworthian contingents, the fruit of his labour was small indeed. Overseas recruitment was resumed in the post-1918 period, but lack of results led to their cessation in 1921.[94] Despite heavy immigration from continental Europe and the United States, neither area was ever included in Woodsworth's recruitment tours.

In addition to these sources, Woodsworth had access to the Western colleges of which Wesley College, Winnipeg, was the oldest. It had been organized in 1888 as part of the University of Manitoba and had obtained permanent buildings in 1896. Unfortunately for the mission work, the college placed great emphasis upon professionalism and a settled ministry and was distrustful of the evangelistic approach which had served so well on the frontier in earlier years.[95] It was increasingly evident that new approaches would have to be explored in missionizing the West.

The initiation of Church Union discussions in 1902 produced hope but not an immediate solution. Therefore the Methodists turned to cooperation in the form of "union congregations" or the delimitation of areas of work. By 1925, 1,244 churches were involved of which 1,015 were in the West.[96] Second, there was an expansion of facilities in the West to train ministers; the details of this will be considered later. And finally, as a way of providing the West with part time workers and the probationers with summer employment and field experience, the 1906 General Conference instituted a program of summer field work.[97] Union, however, offered the best hope for solving the problem and hence it gained strong support in the West.

The increasing urbanization and industrialization of Canadian life also influenced theological education and encouraged church union. The task confronting Methodism was, at this point, essentially the reverse of that confronting Presbyterianism. The Presbyterians were "church" oriented and would have to modify their emphasis upon the professional ministry to provide scope for the talent of the increasingly active middle class laity. The "conservative" elements of Presbyterianism would have to be convinced of the merit of new approaches for meeting the needs of urban industrial labor. In contrast the Methodists would have to become more "church" in nature to serve urban needs and develop a program to serve the industrial class. As early as 1894 the *Guardian* had reported

> The appointment [by General Conference] of a Committee on Sociology and the adoption of its report poses special significance. The questions that have arisen between capital and labour, and regarding the distribution of wealth, have become burning questions. . . . The basis of all improvement must be found in the improvement of individual character; but the principles of the Christian religion should be embodied and wrought out in our political, municipal and business life. . . .[98]

This General Conference also appointed a Standing Committee on Temperance which provided the base for the Department of Temperance, Prohibition and Moral Reform which was formed in 1902,[99] the same year in which the Presbyterians created a similar department. This was, in effect, an admission that the results of working through the congregations to influence individuals and in turn society was unsatisfactory. The new department was to work at the individual and governmental levels to effect change and was authorized to cooperate with other interested agencies. At this point opinion within Methodism varied greatly as to the nature of social problems in the cities and the methods best suited to their solution.

> The deliverance of the General Conference . . . touching social and industrial problems was a wise, comprehensive, far reaching one. . . . The leaders of our church are alive to the importance of the great questions that today are agitating the industrial world; and our church . . . still stands for no privileged class but is the champion of the cause of "the people". . . . The Conference pronounced in favour of compulsory arbitration for the settlement of labour disputes, for some system of partnership between employer and employed, for the civic control of public utilities, and the civic development of public resources. . . .[100]

> The greatest evils--both physical and moral--are found in rear tenements, in narrow, unlighted alleys, in tenements with basement or cellar rooms, and in overcrowded tenements poorly lighted and poorly ventilated. . . . Disease and vice had been

> fostered so long in some of the properties for which rent is collected, that [they are] a menace to public health and public morals. Such properties should be purchased by the city, the buildings should be destroyed, and the land turned into a public garden.[101]

Proposed solutions to urban problems ranged from reordering the economic system to burying them under a public garden. In time the new board expanded its range of interests and chose a course of action between the extremes. Inadequate resources and disappointing results forced it to work increasingly in cooperation with other religious and non-religious agencies, and to work strongly in support of church union. In the post-1918 period the church's position on issues such as the Winnipeg General Strike would alienate many of the laboring class and, indeed, some of the ministers, prominent among whom was James S. Woodsworth.[102] Despite its desire for positive social reform, the Methodist Church was regarded by many it sought to serve as a class church.[103]

Cutting across the urban-rural lines was the great concern of the Methodists for the new immigrants which came in ever increasing numbers after 1896. This took tangible form in the cities in a variety of educational, social service, and religious programs while in rural areas a variety of medical, educational, and religious services were provided.[104] Again, costs forced the Methodists into a variety of cooperative efforts and this phase of the work became active in support of union.

In addition to the problems posed by the Western, urban, and immigrant situations, Methodism was confronted in 1910 by the issue of modern Biblical scholarship. On the success of resolving this issue rested the future of the ministers that had been trained in its ways, the future of the proposed union with the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches, the future of the professors in the colleges of the church, the future role of the colleges themselves, and the future of the role of the laymen in the church.

The Ministry

Two issues affecting the ministry carried over into the 1910-1925 period. The first was the issue of a time limit on stationings. Every General Conference received requests for its abolition and all were refused. The period closed as it had begun with the policy that appointments would be for four years with a minimum of four years between appointments to the same charge. Exceptions to this were General Conference officers, professors in the colleges, superannuated and supernumerary ministers, and men in certain types of work which, in the opinion of supervising Boards or Settlement Committees, would suffer if they were moved.[105] Second, efforts were made to give laymen a voice in the appointment of ministers to specific positions. As early as 1890 it had been proposed that Quarterly Boards be permitted to approach ministers with the view of obtaining their services. The idea was revived in proposals to the 1910, 1914, and 1918 General Conferences but, as earlier, it was rejected.[106] The General Conferences of 1910, 1914, and 1918 were also requested to admit laymen to the Settlement Committee. The consistent rejection of this proposal[107] was easier than the other two as membership of the Settlement Committee had been defined in the "Basis of Union" and so fell under its protective clause.

These issues were closely related. As the upper and middle urban influence became dominant in the church courts, its representatives found that the itinerant system could be used to their advantage. Settlement committees were gradually pressured into the practice of appointing ministers to charges of approximate prestige to that which they were leaving. Prominent ministers supported this practice as it assured them of comfortable futures, and disagreeable appointments served as a disciplinary device to control those ministers who aroused ire in influential circles but whose conduct did not justify "defrocking."[108] Thus the itinerant system, originally intended to distribute ministerial "talent" throughout the church, enabled the prominent ministers to circulate in "musical chairs" fashion among the prominent and influential congregations while the lesser charges and less capable and less influential ministers were left to suffer endlessly with each other. The requests from those suffering under the system to the General Conference to modify the system by permitting laymen to serve on the Settlement Committee or to allow congregations and ministers some voice in appointments came to nought for that august body was dominated by those most profiting by the existing arrangement. Hence the advocates of change turned their efforts to vigorous support of church union. The "Proposed Basis of Union," in circulation since 1908, set no time limit upon pastoral terms of office, provided for both lay and clerical membership in Settlement (Stationing) Committees, and permitted ministers to obtain placement through such committees or through response to a call or invitation from a congregation.

While the details of the resolution of the Biblical Scholarship issue will be presented later, let it suffice here to say that it was agreed that diversity of opinion would be tolerated within the church. This 1910 General Conference decision was, however, theoretical, and many felt that the role of General Superintendent Albert Carman required a counter-balance. This led, in part, to the election in 1910 of a second General Superintendent in the person of S. D. Chown.[109] Chown was much younger, sympathetic to modern scholarship, well known for his social reform work, and a major figure in Methodist Church Union activities.[110] Carman died in 1917 and was not replaced, thus leaving Chown as the only General Superintendent. However interest in the Bible and Biblical Theology was now in decline as a result of three factors: first, Biblical criticism lost itself in textual "nit-picking"; second, liberal theology raised doubts as to the importance, if not the reality, of the supernatural element of Christianity; and third, the Social Gospel focussed attention upon the ethical and social implications of Christianity rather than upon Scripture.[111] The opposition to modern Biblical scholarship made its final effort to gain control in 1922 by means of a "commission to investigate and make an authoritative pronouncement on certain disputed questions." Their request was refused on the basis that no "final conclusions on the matters in question" could be reached by such a method.[112] The compromise was thus preserved by a loss of strength on one side through a shift in interest and on the other by the denial of the traditional means by which its views were imposed. The technique was also used by the Joint Committee on Church Union to the distress of the extremists who desired no definition and a clear repudiation of the fundamentalist position and to the opposite extremists who desired a precise doctrinal position with no allowance for deviation.

The thorny issue of admission of women to the ministry was raised at the 1918 General Conference which referred the matter to the Quarterly Official Board and ordered a report for 1922.[113] The report[114] was indecisive, only 53.4 per cent of the Official Quarterly Boards had responded to the questionnaire and only 47.6 per cent of the church's Board Members had cast ballots. The returns showed 52.4 per cent of the Boards and 53.4 per cent of the Board Members opposed to the admission of women to the ministry. The strength of the opposition to admitting women to the ministry centered in Ontario, while their support centered in Alberta and Saskatchewan which still had some frontier qualities. The 1922 General Conference received the report but did not raise the question on the floor and it joined the host of issues that would be raised again in the Union.

The Colleges

The basic Church-College relationship was greatly improved by the actions of the 1910 General Conference. At the General Conference level, the Board of Management of the Educational Society was reorganized to include the General Superintendents, the Secretary of Education, the General Treasurers of the Society, one representative from each of the colleges doing theological instruction, seven prominent ministers and seven prominent laymen. The Board of Management of the Conference Educational Society were reorganized to consist of one layman elected by each of the Districts and were to be presided over by the Presidents of the Conferences.[115] This identified the work of the Society with the leadership of the church at the upper level and involved the laity at the lower level. This proved so satisfactory that the arrangement was retained throughout the period.

Two issues during the period arose to threaten the established Church-College relationship. The furore that followed the unilateral decision by the principal of Wesley College, Winnipeg, to abolish the college's Arts and Science program in the interest of economy led the 1918 General Conference to rule that no area of teaching could be removed from a college curriculum without Board of Education approval.[116] Nor was the 1922 General Conference prepared to allow the Secretary of Education and his assistant to assume policy making roles. Their functions were specifically defined as "promotion of the work of the Society, making annual surveys and reports, raising of funds, student recruitment, and publication of the Annual Report of the Society."[117] Thus the old Church-College relationship was retained.

The issue of Biblical scholarship was of major importance both in terms of the Church-College relationship and in the threat it raised to the unity of Methodism at a time when it was attempting to extend its overseas and Western work and was involved in church union negotiations. The choice presented to the 1910 General Conference[118] was apparently between a conservative theology and a literal approach to Biblical studies or a more liberal theology and the modern methods of Biblical studies. The conservative element was led by General Superintendent Albert Carman who had conducted a vicious campaign against G. Workman and G. Jackson, prominent British-born and trained figures in the liberal element. Their fault lay in teaching that the first five books in the Bible were of multiple and not Mosaic authorship; that the Creation story is theological in nature and not literal history; and that the Scriptures, being written by a variety of authors over a long span of time, were of varying degrees of insight and spirituality rather than being of Divine inspiration and of uniform quality. The General Conference adopted the Education Committee recommendation,

> No teaching or preaching shall be allowed in any College, School or other connexional Educational Institution, nor shall any person teach or be permitted to teach therein, any doctrine contrary to or inconsistent with the standards of doctrine and Articles of Religion of the Methodist Church, and it shall be the duty of the governing persons, boards, presidents and other chief officers of such Colleges, Schools and Institutions to see that this provision is strictly observed.[119]

While disappointed in their efforts to have this amended specifically to repudiate liberal teachings, the conservatives could not vote against it because its wording would have made their position untenable. The liberals could support the motion as the fifth of the "Articles of Religion" of the Methodist Church stated

> The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or thought requisite or necessary to salvation.

Hence their ideas would be measured by Scripture, not by the theology of Carman and his followers. Diversity of opinion and academic freedom, but not academic licence, was thus assured by

Conference. Trial procedures were also provided by the General Conference[120] to safeguard those accused of errant teaching from "trial by newspaper articles" or by hobbyists. The resolution of this issue by the General Conference was very similar to and probably influenced by the 1908 American Methodist General Conference decision in the Borden Parke Bowne case.[121] The decision of Canadian Methodism in favour of responsible Biblical scholarship moved it close to that which had been traditional in Canadian Congregationalism and which had been held by the Presbyterians since 1875.

The colleges in the four Western provinces were all experiencing difficulties during this period and the 1914 General Conference directed the Board of Education to meet in Winnipeg with representatives from each of the existing or prospective western colleges to consider "the entire question of our educational policy for the West, including the location of colleges in the West, and the limits of the curricula in each college."[122] This and all subsequent inquiries found that the Western colleges problem had two dimensions. There were obviously too many colleges in the West, the result of local activity born of a mixture of genuine concern for education, eagerness to promote institutions that would result in community economic gain, resentment over the apparent favoured treatment accorded other communities, and a desire to benefit by proximity to other institutions. In Alberta, the Methodists opened colleges in Edmonton, which later became the provincial capital; in Calgary, which deeply resented its failure to become the capital or to become the site of the provincial university; and in Strathcona, which had become the site of the provincial university.[123] In Saskatchewan, a college was opened in the capital, Regina, despite the earlier location of the provincial university in Saskatoon.[124] In British Columbia, colleges were opened in New Westminster, at the time a "gateway to the interior," and in Vancouver after it was chosen as site for the provincial university.[125] Wesley College, Winnipeg, remained the sole Methodist college in Manitoba but it suffered as the other western colleges entered into competition for the available support and students. The curriculum aspect of the problem will be considered later. The reduction of both available support and students during the First World War further weakened the situation of the Western colleges and made imperative the finding of a solution to their problems.[126]

The second dimension of the Western colleges problem was made evident by the efforts of the General Conference to rationalize the educational work in the West. The General Conference took the traditional view that it should direct the total college work in the best interests of the whole church. Hence it appointed committees to deal with the matter in 1914, 1918, and 1922, and went so far as to obtain a legal opinion that it did indeed have this and certain property rights.[127] The temptation to exert its powers was, however, sharply curbed by two factors. The report of a two year study by the "Massey Foundation Commission on the Secondary Schools and Colleges of the Methodist Church of Canada" was issued in 1921 which indicated that the benefits of economy in operation, larger student bodies, larger and more competent faculties, and more adequate libraries to be gained by the concentration of the colleges were balanced by the benefits of decentralization of stronger local support, ministerial training more suited to the local conditions, and the avoidance of the difficulties likely to be encountered in the amalgamation of the existing institutions.[128] The General Conference and its committees had earlier experienced stubborn resistance in the West to their proposals and there was a general hesitancy to precipitate an open conflict between centralization and regionalism, metropolitanism and frontierism. The General Conference of 1922 went no further than the observation,

> When we remember the limited number of probationers at college and the difficulty of securing teachers of acknowledged scholarship, pedagogical skill, and strong personality for the staff of our theological institutions, we are driven to the conclusion that, in the interests of both economy and efficiency, there should be some consolidation of our theological work.

Here the matter rested until the Union of 1925.

Methodist colleges throughout the "united" period had been financed by endowments, tuition fees, and a general fund. By 1910 it was apparent that the general fund was too subject to fluctuations in the general economy, and that traditional methods were providing insufficient support.

The instability of the General Fund was subject to easy solution. The 1910 General Conference approved the establishment of a "Permanent Fund."[129] This was essentially an endowment fund for the General Fund and was built up by the legacies and bequests received by the Educational Society which, since 1898, had become more numerous and larger, and by funds received in repayment of loans made to probationers. The latter could be drawn upon if the need was "imperative." The rapid growth of the fund confirmed the wisdom of the plan.[130]

The problem of insufficient funds for educational purposes proved more difficult. In general, the Methodists attempted to make existing fund raising methods as effective as possible while introducing schemes to reduce costs. The latter found expression in two major innovations. The first was a summer work program for probationers at college which was introduced by the 1910 General Conference.[131] This reduced the need for loans and grants during the students' following term in college, while providing valuable field work experience and making available a cadre of partially trained workers for the city missions and rural fields. This was of special importance to the Western fields which were perennially short of personnel. Yet by 1922 it was evident that the success of the plan in terms of reducing costs was limited and that aid to probationers, despite the shortage of funds, would have to be increased.[132]

The second innovation was that of cooperation with other denominations in providing theological training. Such arrangements reduced faculty and facility requirements while providing equal if not superior programs of studies. Formal cooperative activity began in 1912 in Montreal with an arrangement that involved the Methodists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Anglicans.[133] By 1922 cooperative arrangements were established in Edmonton and Winnipeg and were planned for Toronto and Vancouver.[134] Methodist publications and records of the period expressed less enthusiasm for cooperation than did those of the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists. The Methodists were under some financial stress but it was not so severe as that experienced by the Presbyterians, and the Congregationalists were close to disaster in their college financing. The Methodists also benefitted from the cooperative Forward Movement. General Superintendent S. D. Chown reported to the 1922 General Conference that $4,000,000 had been received and the original objective surpassed.[135] Of the proceeds, $750,000 was allocated to the colleges and used for reduction of indebtedness save in the following cases: Albert College which applied the funds to new buildings, Alma College which applied it to necessary and substantial repairs, and Wesley College, Winnipeg, which applied it to endowment.[136]

Thus the benefits of a wave of enthusiasm were turned to a very conservative, if not stodgy, use in the colleges. On this note the Methodists joined the 1925 Union. While the Methodist colleges were more secure because of the policies employed, there was little in the policies that was new and, of the aspects that were new, there was little that was uniquely Methodist. Even the productive and potentially exciting developments in cooperative college operations and fund raising failed to excite the traditionally enthusiastic Methodists.

The various submissions to the 1906 General Conference calling for the recruitment of more men for the ministry all made reference to the needs of the West but made little if any reference to the East. The need for men in the West had partly arisen from the rapid spread of settlement but of more far reaching implications was the fact that for a dozen years the training program had been lengthened and academic standards had been raised in accordance with eastern and urban desires. As Woodsworth had discovered, there was an increasing reluctance if not inability for graduates to serve in the primitive West. Under great pressure the General Conference had permitted the employment of partially trained Evangelical Workers but it steadfastly refused to allow them to serve without a time limit of employment.[137] However, even among those committed to urban needs and a professional ministry, there was a new note of discord. A small but vocal group was emerging that desired a ministry capable of serving the new immigrant and industrial worker elements of the large city populations. Just prior to the 1910 General Conference, J. S. Woodsworth, son of the Superintendent of Missions, raised the issue in the pages of the *Guardian*.[138]

> It is generally recognized that a minister ought to be a preacher or a pastor--if possible both. But under present day conditions . . . in the city church he must be more or less of a church manager, [and be] able to organize . . . [and] be promoters of all that makes for the uplift of society. . . . The minister should know how to visit in the homes, . . . hospitals, and other institutions, how to train children, [but] all this he must learn as best he may . . . .
>
> What could be substituted for dead issues and dead languages? (1) a good training in English . . . , (2) one of the natural sciences . . . , (3) for the mission specialist, a knowledge of . . . [one of the] tongues of the immigrants to Canada . . . , and (4) for every student a thorough course in social science and service . . . .

J. S. Woodworth and others sharing his views had no quarrel with the trend toward professionalism; their concern was with course content and, as will be seen later, they achieved a measure of success in their efforts.

The trend to a more professional ministry led, in 1918, to the General Conference ruling that probationers with matriculation would attend college for three years while those who had taken the "Alternative Preliminary Course" would attend for four years except in those cases where individuals successfully completed the four year program in three terms.[139] The people promoting longer and more academic preparation were successful in convincing the 1922 General Conference to extend the college program to four years but the over-zealous were disappointed in their efforts to have the training of probationers, save the very few who were married, extended to six years of which five would be in college and one in circuit work.[140] The measure failed to pass for three important reasons: first, it was intended to apply to practically all probationers whereas the Methodists were accustomed to a variety of programs leading to ordination in recognition of the diverse backgrounds and abilities of the probationers; second, by increasing the college requirement from three to five years, extraordinary strain would have been placed upon the colleges; and finally, the measure would have long delayed the entry into full time service of seriously needed men.

An unexpected result of the trend toward professionalism was the role that the colleges themselves played in attracting university students who had not previously shown any interest in the ministry. The Education Society based its 1914 and 1918 appeals for financial support for the colleges upon this fact.[141] The numbers thus attracted, however, did not begin to meet the need so the Methodists made recruitment of men for the ministry and other forms of "life service," a main feature of their "Foreward Campaign." In 1922 the General Superintendent reported that over 1,000 young people had responded to the call but he did not specify the number choosing the ministry.[142]

All of this must be viewed in relation to two other facts: the only serious efforts to attract trained men from other lands and/or other churches to service in Canada were made by James Woodsworth who was responsible for work in the West; and the records of the period are singularly free of references to the entry of men from other churches. It may, therefore, be concluded that Methodism was able to recruit sufficient men to meet the demands of the East. In training men for service in this area, many of them became reluctant to serve in the West, thus compounding the shortage already created by the church's expansion in that area. At the same time there was little to attract men from other churches; they were not needed in the East, and they, too, were not attracted to the harsh conditions of service in the West.

Changes in the curriculum naturally reflected the trend toward professionalism and the urban influence. The 1910 General Conference retained as the standard for the Preliminary Course of the Ordinary Course matriculation to a British or Canadian university, a teaching certificate, or for people in special circumstances, an alternative set of examinations. However those who qualified through the last mentioned means were now required to complete matriculation before reception into "full connexion."[143] After 1922 this requirement had to be met before the end of the second probationary year.[144] The course content of the various programs was left unchanged in 1910 save for a slightly greater emphasis upon English literature and a somewhat wider choice of options was permitted in the last two years at college.[145] While still a far cry from the reforms advocated by J. S. Woodsworth and his associates, this enabled students with such inclinations to better prepare for service with urban industrial workers or immigrants.

During the following years the clamor for curriculum reform increased. One of the articles in the *Guardian* presented the issue as follows,

> *First*, the changed attitude of the public toward organized religion. The social, industrial and economic changes have been such that the Christian Church fronts a radically new world. The Church is no longer the common rallying center of the people, nor the exclusive avenue of social intercourse. The pulpit has ceased to be the main medium of instruction, even on moral and religious questions. The sacredness of all callings has been persistently preached . . . hence the ministry is not the only sacred calling but one of many. . . .
>
> *Second*, this restlessness . . . is due, in no small degree, to the sadly inadequate and irrelevant training . . . which students for the ministry receive at college. . . . In the face of the great world changes . . . theological students should not be held down to a course of study which, in the main, was determined two hundred years ago.
>
> An ideal college course . . . should accomplish . . . three things: . . . a broad and general culture, . . . fearless independency of thought and action, . . . definite and technical training for the work in which these young men are to engage. . . .[146]

The 1914 General Conference responded with a major curriculum revision of the Ordinary Course. First year circuit course requirements were Homiletics and two of the following: English Bible, Greek New Testament, and History of Missions. Second year circuit requirements were Homiletics, Sociology (including a study of the local circuit), and three of the following: English Bible, Greek New Testament, Theology, and Church History. The reduction in the number of courses was offset by substantial increases in the standard of competency required in each course. The courses to be studied at college were Old and New Testament, Theology, Church History, Preaching, Church Polity and Discipline, English Literature and Language, Logic and Psychology, and three of the following: Apologetics, Sociology, Missions (Comparative Religion and History of Religion), Ethics and History of Philosophy, and Religious Pedagogy. Supervised Field Work was acceptable as an elective. Students were allowed to use their own discretion in choosing their electives.[147] The program presupposed that the probationers, having passed the Preliminary Course, were of proven educational capacity.

The program did not, however, still the clamor for more opportunity to specialize, and two new notes were added, classification of students and graduate studies. As usual the problem was aired in the *Guardian*.

> The Minister and His Training
>
> Our theological education ignores too largely the realities of present day life. . . . There is too little classification of students. Graduates in arts must take the same classes as students who have not matriculated. This is unfair to both. There is no specialization permitted. The work of the ministry is now rapidly becoming specialized into a number of departments but . . . [the student] is not allowed to make any special preparation. There is no graduate school in any Canadian Methodist college. . . .
>
> For years theological students have been dissatisfied with their training.[148]

Moreover the 1918 General Conference received some thirty "memorials" or requests for curriculum changes. These reflected the three interests noted earlier: successful urban, urban industrial, and frontier. A committee was struck to consider all this and to make recommendations to the next General Conference.[149]

The 1922 General Conference, as noted earlier, rejected the proposal to lengthen the course for all probationers but it did accept curriculum content recommendations. While there were no significant changes in the content of the program, the sequence was radically changed. The first year at college was devoted to "literary and scientific subjects of equivalent status to that of the first two years in Arts." The remaining three years were spent entirely on theological studies.[150] The restriction on options assured a more uniform training of ministers and the overall effect of the revision was to restore the decision making role in courses to the General Conference. In effect this was a return to pre-1914 practices.

The regulations applying to the exceptions to the Ordinary Course experienced little change during the period. The old regulation allowing students to take the course in the English, French, Indian, Chinese, or Japanese languages was extended in 1910 to "other non-English-speaking candidates." Of greater significance was the 1910 requirement that Evangelical Workers seeking ordination complete the full five year Ordinary Course and the matriculation subjects of English, Mathematics, Greek, History, Geography, and one of Latin, French, German, and Natural Science (Physics or Biology).[151] The Methodists would tolerate the Evangelical Worker as a concession to the needs of the frontier but not as a "short cut" to ordination.

The Special Course of probationers with the degree B.A. was changed in 1914 so that the two years at college harmonized as far as possible with the first two years of the B.D. program.[152] This encouraged men to continue into a third year but it also contributed to a cleavage between degree and non-degree ministers. The 1922 three year program permitted the completion of the third year extramurally and restored the old emphasis on preparation for pastoral service rather than the obtaining of the B.D. degree. The Special Course for medical missionaries remained unchanged.[153]

After 1910 the Methodists were increasingly concerned with the problems besetting their colleges in the area west of Ontario. The 1910 General Conference had modified the organization of the work in this area by organizing Conferences that corresponded with the 1905 provincial boundaries.[154] References to the situation of the colleges in these Conferences as the "Western colleges problem" were geographically correct but ignored important factors of population, economics, institutional backgrounds, and program differences.

Prior to 1900 the Methodists had two western colleges and their experience strongly influenced decisions affecting the newer colleges. Wesley College, Winnipeg, began operation in 1888 under a charter replacing those obtained earlier by the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Church of Canada. Its function was to train men for the Methodist ministry and it offered courses leading to university entrance, the degrees B.A. and B.D., and other courses required for ordination. In 1890 the initial role of the University of Manitoba was expanded from examining and degree granting to teaching in disciplines other than theology which was left to the affiliated Anglican, Presbyterian, and Methodist colleges. The affiliated colleges retained the rights to offer courses which they felt were necessary and to grant Bachelor and Doctor of Divinity degrees, while the University assumed the right to examine candidates in the areas of Greek, Latin, and Mathematics.[155] This arrangement precluded the competition for students, funds, and community loyalty that would have followed the offering of parallel programs of study. It was also of substantial economic benefit to the church in removing the need to offer a wide program of instruction when science instructional costs were spiralling. The arrangement closely resembled that of Wesley College, Montreal with McGill University, although McGill was a private rather than provincial institution and there was less need in Montreal to offer courses other than theology. As this need declined in Winnipeg, Wesley College reduced the scope of its curriculum. The satisfaction of the General Conference with this approach was indicated in the 1922 Commission on Education report that the quality of results equalled those of Victoria and Mount Allison Universities.[156] Yet this ignored Woodsworth's observation made thirty years earlier that the curriculum transplanted from the eastern colleges did not adequately prepare men for service in the West.

Meanwhile the manifest advantages in the Winnipeg approach had led the General Conference to adopt it for other colleges. Approval and assistance to Columbian College, New Westminster, were withheld in 1894 until it was agreed that nothing would be done which would hinder the moving of the college to the University of British Columbia site when its location should be determined.[157]

This condition proved detrimental, in that the people actively developing the college were forced to regard their efforts as tentative and it was difficult to foster local support for an institution that might be moved.

In its curriculum planning, Columbian College, like Wesley, followed the pattern of several eastern Methodist colleges. Albert, Victoria, and Mount Allison had all been created to train ministers and in serving local needs had offered programs leading to university entrance and various other areas of study at the university level besides theology. In time, the availability of some of these services by other institutions led to the narrowing of curriculum: Victoria discontinued its college preparatory work, Albert College discontinued its university programs, and Mount Allison alone continued to offer a wide program. In the West, Wesley College was able to narrow the scope of its work because of its proximity to the University of Manitoba. Lacking neighbouring institutions and faced with a wide range of community needs, Columbian College followed the path taken by Mount Allison. Necessary as this was, it ignored important differences in the circumstances. Mount Allison had been opened in 1843 with the encouragement of wealthy patrons when a "wide curriculum" was still relatively narrow and inexpensive. Over the years the curriculum had indeed expanded but so had support of the college until, in 1894, the university assets were valued at over one and one-third millions of dollars and its endowments exceeded two and one-half millions.[158] In contrast, Columbian College had no wealthy supporters or endowments and was attempting to introduce a wide curriculum in an age when this was an expensive undertaking.

Alberta College, Edmonton, was opened in 1903 and adopted the Columbian College approach of the wide curriculum as there was no nearby university. Courses were offered leading to university entrance, second year Arts, and theology. The Arts courses were patterned after those of McGill with which the college was affiliated. Courses were also offered in Business, Music, and Elocution to which courses were later added in physical culture and telegraphy. Special efforts were made to serve the needs of immigrants with language problems.[159] The opening of the University of Alberta in Strathcona in 1908 radically changed the situation and it was expected that Alberta College would be moved to the university site. Instead, J. H. Riddell, principal of Alberta College, quickly organized a funds campaign and in 1910 a residence and school of theology was opened in Strathcona under the name of Alberta College South.[160] In limiting its curriculum to courses leading to university entrance, some Arts courses not available at the university, and theology, Alberta College South followed the Wesley College approach to the letter. Meanwhile Alberta College North modified its curriculum to university entrance and such courses as were not being offered by the university or Alberta College South. Several factors militated against the closure of Alberta College North. It was providing services unavailable elsewhere in the Edmonton region and which commanded a wide measure of community support, and its association with the pioneer McDougall family provided a tie with the past not to be readily discarded. Yet these very factors presented problems to the newer institution. There was a limit to the available support for educational purposes and Alberta College North had the advantage in appeal. To offset this, Alberta College South entered into the cooperative arrangements with the Presbyterians noted earlier.

Columbian College responded to the opening of the University of British Columbia in 1911 in Vancouver by initiating plans for "Ryerson College." Ryerson College was to be a residence and theological school on the university site. Columbian College withdrew from both Arts and Theological instruction by 1914 but the move was premature. The War and economic conditions so delayed the development of Ryerson that Columbian was forced to resume theological instruction in the post-war period. In the final analysis this delay may have been beneficial in that Ryerson College development was increasingly predicated on cooperation with the Anglicans and the Presbyterians.[161]

The other western Methodist colleges were Regina and Mount Royal, Calgary. Both were opened in 1911 after the opening of the universities in their respective provinces, and were partly expressions of local dissatisfaction with the location of the provincial universities. Neither college offered Arts because of the universities, or theology. Methodists in Alberta could take theology at Alberta College South and Methodists in Saskatchewan, like Congregationalists, were made welcome at the Presbyterian College in Saskatoon or could attend Wesley College, Winnipeg.[162] While of limited interest to this study because of their lack of theological programs, these colleges deserve mention in that they entered the competition for the available support. All efforts to rationalize the activities of the Western colleges failing, their problems were carried into the Union of 1925.

The crucial question was, of course, whether the Methodist policies had met the needs of the church. The minister/church member ratio in 1886 had been 1/121, in 1906 it had been 1/140, and in 1922, the last year that the General Conference published statistics, it was 1/244.[163] The rate of deterioration of the ratio was approximately one member per minister per year during the earlier period and six and one-half during the second. Compared to the Presbyterian rate of 3.4 during the second period this appears disastrous. However, examining the ratios regionally for 1922 a close parallel to the Presbyterians is to be found: Maritimes, 1/199 (Presbyterians, 1/205); Central Provinces, 1/325 (Presbyterians, 1/283), Prairie Provinces 1/138 (Presbyterians 1/176), and British Columbia, 1/137 (Presbyterians, 1/140). Moreover in both cases the expressions of concern came from the Western provinces rather than from central Canada where the ratios appeared to be most serious. Indeed the Methodist ratio of 1/325 compared to the Presbyterian 1/283 was the point of greatest disparity. However, this region was quiet on the matter of expanding the ministry, a tribute to the effective manner in which laymen had become involved in assuming responsibility for the operation of the church. However, this is not to suggest that their policies were free from criticism. Many individuals, lay and clergy, throughout the church or, in some matters, whole regions of the church, were dissatisfied with the policies. Contentious issues were the time limit of pastorates and the appointment methods of the ministers, the lack of lay voice in appointments, and the refusal to allow women into the ministry. Perhaps the most disturbing problem was the uneasy feeling that Methodism had become a class church in that it had not successfully met the needs of the industrial workers in the cities, was losing its effectiveness in serving frontier needs, and was not coping adequately with the challenge of immigrant groups in either setting. Of course related to the problem of the frontier was the failure of the church to resolve the difficulties of the western colleges. Thus, while the Presbyterians largely looked to the Union as a possible solution to their shortage of ministers, the Methodists saw it principally as a possible solution to a variety of administrative and policy problems which hindered their work in ministering to their people and to the nation. Thus, in 1925, twenty-three years after its first serious proposal, the Methodists entered the Union confident that they were entering a new era of Christian service.

FOOTNOTES

[1] A. Sutherland, *Methodism in Canada* (Toronto, 1904), pp. 33-39, 96-100, 113-132. W. J. Townsend, H. B. Workman, G. Eayrs, ed., *A New History of Methodism* (London, 1909), II, pp. 201, 206-209.

[2] J. Lathern, "Historical Sketch of Methodism in the Eastern Provinces," pp. 35-45; H. Johnston, "Historical Sketch of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Upper and Lower Canada," pp. 55-94; W. Williams, "Historical Sketch of the Methodist New Connexion Church in Canada," pp. 95-121; J. C. Antliffe, "Historical Sketch of the Primitive Methodst Church in Canada," pp. 181-204; G. Webber, "Bible Christian Church," pp. 205-216, *Centennial of Canadian Methodism* (Toronto, 1891). A. Sutherland, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-268. J. E. Sanderson, *The First Century of Methodism in Canada* (Toronto, 1908), I, pp. 62-74, 99-109, 137-150, 176-190, 206, 207, 214-218, 224-226, 274-277, 302-304, 333-334, 387, 422-424, 446-447; II, pp. 12-19, 56-59, 89. W. J. Townsend, H. B. Workman, G. Eayrs, eds., *op. cit.*, II, pp. 201-223, 457-460. C. E. Silcox, *Church Union in Canada* (New York, 1933), pp. 47-50. S. D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada* (Toronto, 1948), pp. 55-63, 93-100, 146-161, 194-204, 262-271, 284-287, 292-300, 307-312. H. H. Walsh, *The Christian Church in Canada* (Toronto, 1956), pp. 123-128, 137-141, 176-184, 214,215. E. R. Schwarz, "Samuel Dwight Chown, An Architect of Canadian Church Union," (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston University, 1961), pp. 12-23.

[3] J. M. Buckley, *A History of the Methodists in the United States* (New York, 1896), pp. 283-284. A. Sutherland, *op. cit.*, pp. 314-328. W. J. Townsend, H. B. Workman, G. Eayrs, eds., *op. cit.*, II, pp. 219-221. J. E. Sanderson, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 247-248, 250-252, 255, 264, 271-273, 277-279, 284-285, 288-290, 295-300. C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-51. S. D. Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 297-300, 320, 327, 334, 345-346. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 214-216. J. W. Caldwell, "The Unification of Methodism in Canada, 1865-1884," *The Bulletin* (Toronto, 1967), 19, pp. 9-23.

[4] J. W. Caldwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-45.

[5] W. J. Townsend, H. B. Workman, G. Eayrs, eds., *op. cit.*, II, pp. 84, 221, 462, 465.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 448-450, 472-482. E. R. Schwarz, "Jabez Bunting, Wesleyan Methodist Churchman," (unpublished S.T.M. Thesis, Southern Methodist University, 1958), pp. 23-24, 57-76. K. A. Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York, 1953), p. 1387.

[7] W. J. Townsend, H. B. Workman, G. Eayrs, eds. *op. cit.*, II, pp. 83-91, 102-103, 124-140, 451-454, 507-528, 533. For a detailed history of American Methodism, see W. W. Sweet, *Methodism*

in American History (Nashville, 1933, revised 1953). F. S. Mead, *Handbook of Denominations in the United States* (Nashville, 1951), pp. 129-138. E. T. Clark, "Methodism," *The American Church of the Protestant Heritage*, ed. V. Fern (New York, 1953), pp. 325-330.

[8] Methodist Church, *Journal of the Methodist General Conference (1883)* (Toronto, 1883), pp. 301-310. Hereafter cited as *J. M. G. C.*

[9] J. H. Riddell, *Methodism in the Middle West* (Toronto, 1946), pp. 331-332.

[10] *J. M. G. C. (1883)*, pp. 301-304. E. R. Schwarz, "Samuel Dwight Chown, An Architect of Canadian Church Union," pp. 81-87, 182-183. J. W. Caldwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-46.

[11] *J. M. G. C. (1883)*, p. 301.

[12] W. H. Magney, "The Methodist Church and the National Gospel, 1884-1914," *The Bulletin* (Toronto, 1968), 20, p. 19.

[13] *Christian Guardian*, Sept. 29, 1886, p. 611; Sept. 12, 1894, p. 543.

[14] *Ibid.*, Sept. 20, 1886, p. 615; Nov. 3, 1886, p. 696.

[15] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

[16] *J. M. G. C. (1886)*, pp. 271-272; *(1922)*, pp. 423-424.

[17] *Ibid.*, *(1886)*, pp. 256,271; *(1922)*, p. 390.

[18] *Ibid.*, *(1883)*, p. 301. Methodist Church of Canada, *Book of Discipline (1879)*, (Toronto, 1879), pp. 21-33.

[19] *Ibid.*, *(1883)*, p. 303.

[20] *Ibid.*

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 302.

[22] J. W. Caldwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 34, 38.

[23] *J. M. G. C. (1883)*, p. 301.

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88, 106.

[25] A. Sutherland, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

[26] *J. M. G. C. (1883)*, pp. 98, 99, 169-170.

[27] *Christian Guardian*, Sept. 29, 1886, p. 613; Oct. 8, 1890, p. 643; Sept. 19, 1894, p. 596. *J. M. G. C. (1886)*, pp. 85-91; *(1890)*, p. 114; *(1894)*, p. 42.

[28] *J. M. G. C. (1886)*, pp. 85-91; *(1890)*, p. 76; *(1894)*, pp. 42, 43; *(1898)*, pp. 66-71; *(1902)*, pp. 36, 74, 215; *(1906)*, pp. 57, 61, 159-160.

[29] *Christian Guardian*, September 24, 1890, pp. 613, 617.

[30] *Ibid.*, October 10, 1894, p. 648.

[31] *J. M. G. C. (1890)*, pp. 124-125.

[32] *Ibid. (1883)*, p. 309.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 301.

[34] S. G. Stone, "Historical Sketch of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada," p. 174; W. Burwash, "Methodist Education in Canada," pp. 301, 329; *Centennial of Canadian Methodism.* J. E. Sanderson, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 229, 240, 267, 384-386; II, pp. 166, 284-287.

[35] *J. M. G. C. (1883)*, pp. 75, 111, 205-209, 309.

[36] *Ibid. (1886)*, pp. 99, 187, 189-217; *(1890)*, pp. 57-58, 202, 213-216. *Christian Guardian*, Sept. 29, 1886, p. 616; August 20, 1890, pp. 530-532; Sept. 17, 1890, pp. 596, 601; Sept. 24, 1890, pp. 610-611; Sept. 7, 1898, p. 569.

[37] *J.M.C.G. (1886)*, pp. 99, 184; *(1890)*, pp. 203-213, *(1894)* pp. 140-141, 180-181; *(1898)*, pp. 151-152; *(1902)*, pp. 228-230.

[38] *Ibid. (1894)*, pp. 180-181.

[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 181, 182-183.

[40] *Ibid. (1906)*, pp. 76-77, 166-170.

[41] *Ibid. (1883)*, pp. 206-209.

[42] *Ibid. (1886)*, pp. 83-84, 184, 223; *(1890)*, pp. 203-206; *(1894)*, pp. 148-149.

[43] *Ibid. (1898)*, pp. 148-149. *Christian Guardian*, September 7, 1898, pp. 568-569.

[44] *J. M. G. C. (1902)*, p. 228.

[45] *Ibid. (1906)*, p. 168.

[46] *Ibid. (1886)*, p. 224; *(1890)*, pp. 208-210; *(1894)*, pp. 141-142; *(1898)*, p. 150; *(1902)*, pp. 230-231; *(1906)*, p. 323.

[47] *Ibid. (1894)*, pp. 140-141, 180-182.

[48] *Ibid. (1898)*, pp. 188-190.

[49] *Ibid. (1906)*, p. 108.

[50] *Ibid. (1883)*, pp. 303-305.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 166.

[52] *Ibid. (1886)*, p. 171; *(1890)*, p. 74; *(1898)*, p. 193; *(1902)*, p. 133.

[53] *Ibid. (1883)*, pp. 229-231.

[54] *Ibid.*, pp. 226-229, 231, 232.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[56] *Ibid.(1886)*, pp. 119, 171.

[57] *Ibid. (1894)*, pp. 187, 192.

[58] *Ibid. (1906)*, pp. 93, 134-135.

[59] *Ibid. (1886)*, pp. 120, 176.

[60] *Ibid. (1894)*, pp. 187, 192.

[61] *Christian Guardian*, October 10, 1894, p. 648.

[62] *J. M. G. C. (1906)*, pp. 92-93, 129.

[63] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-55. S. D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada*, pp. 368-378, 417-418, 429-430.

[64] *J. M. G. C. (1886)*, p. 120.

[65] *Ibid. (1898)*, pp. 104, 193.

[66] *Ibid. (1902)*, pp. 69, 136-137.

[67] *Christian Guardian*, September 19, 1906, p. 8.

[68] *J. M. G. C. (1906)*, p. 322.

[69] *Ibid. (1883)*, pp. 104-105, 109, 197.

[70] *Ibid. (1894)*, pp. 188, 190.

[71] *Ibid. (1883)*, pp. 104-105, 197-201.

[72] *Ibid. (1890)*, pp. 179-180.

[73] *Ibid. (1894)*, pp. 188-190.

[74] J. Elliott, "The Education of the Clergy," *Q. Q.*, January, 1895, pp. 224-234.

[75] A. E. Lavell, "Theological Education and the Methodist Church," *Christian Guardian*, Nov. 28, 1906, pp. 9-10.

[76] *J. M. G. C. (1883)*, pp. 200-201; *(1886)*, p. 175; *(1890)*, p. 183.

[77] *Ibid. (1883)*, pp. 199-200; *(1894)*, p. 191; *(1898)*, pp. 198-199.

[78] *Ibid. (1906)*, p. 135.

[79] *Ibid.*, pp. 167, 320-322.

[80] W. H. Magney, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-46.

[81] *J. M. G. C. (1896)*, pp. 256, 271; *(1910)*, pp. 385, 426

[82] A. Sutherland, *op. cit.*, pp. 281-286, 301-306. W. J. Townsend, H. B. Workman, G. Eayrs, eds., *op. cit.*, II, pp. 225-226. J. H. Riddell, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-114, 118-119, 132-134, 154. M. Jordan, "George Millward McDougall, Missionary and Nation Building," *Alberta Historical Review*, III, 1, 1955, pp. 24-33. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 254-257. G. Hutchinson, "Early Methodist Missions," *Alberta Historical Review*, VI, 4, 1958, pp. 1-6.

[83] J. Woodsworth, *Thirty Years in the Canadian North-West* (Toronto, 1917), pp. 10-11.

[84] For a discussion of Woodsworth's career, see J. Woodsworth, *op. cit.*

[85] E. H. Oliver, *His Dominion of Canada* (Toronto, 1932), p. 156.

[86] J. Woodsworth, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-49, 184.

[87] E. H. Oliver, *op. cit.*, p. 166. J. H. Riddell, *op. cit.*, pp. 216-217, 243-244.

[88] E. H. Oliver, *op. cit.*, p. 160. J. Woodsworth, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

[89] *Christian Guardian*, October 3, 1906, pp. 6-7.

[90] J. Woodsworth, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

[91] *Ibid.*, pp. 121-138, 220-225. J. H. Riddell, *op. cit.*, pp. 231-232.

[92] *Christian Guardian*, October 17, 1906, p. 2.

[93] A. W. Cann, "All That Was Left," *Christian Guardian*, May 7, 1924, p. 16.

[94] J. H. Riddell, *op. cit.*, pp. 344-345.

[95] *Ibid.*, pp. 186-187, 204-205, 219-221, 232-234. H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 277-278.

[96] J. H. Riddell, *op. cit.*, pp. 241, 308-310, 332-335. C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 227-228.

[97] J. Woodsworth, *op. cit.*, pp. 225-227.

[98] *Christian Guardian*, October 10, 1894, p. 648.

[99] *J. M. G. C. (1894)*, pp. 294-297; *(1898)*, p. 105; *(1902)*, pp. 218-219.

[100] *Christian Guardian*, September 24, 1902, p. 608.

[101] *Ibid.*, November 12, 1902, p. 728.

[102] For a biography see K. McNaught, *A Prophet in Politics* (Toronto, 1959).

[103] J. H. Riddell, *op. cit.*, pp. 347-348.

[104] *Ibid.*, pp. 215-216, 250, 253-257, 282-287, 300-301, 342-344. W. H. Magney, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-77.

[105] *J. M. G. C. (1922)*,

[106] *Ibid. (1890)*, pp. 124-125; *(1910)*, pp. 60, 381; *(1914)*, pp. 76-78, 376; *(1918)*, pp. 130-131.

[107] *Ibid. (1910)*, pp. 60, 381; *(1914)*, pp. 76, 376; *(1918)*, pp. 98-99.

[108] C. A. Krug, Interview, January, 1968.

[109] *J. M. G. C. (1910)*, p. 78.

[110] E. R. Schwarz, "Samuel Dwight Chown, An Architect of Canadian Church Union," pp. 155-188.

[111] G. A. Boyle, "Higher Criticism and the Struggle for Academic Freedom in Canadian Methodism," Unpublished Th.D. Dissertation, Victoria University, 1965, p. 449.

[112] *J. M. G. C. (1922)*, p. 352.

[113] *Ibid. (1918)*, p. 82.

[114] *Ibid. (1922)*, pp. 53-54.

[115] *Ibid. (1910)*, pp. 105-106, 366-373.

[116] J. H. Riddell, *op. cit.*, pp. 323-325. *J. M. G. C. (1918)*, p. 325.

[117] *J. M. G. C. (1922)*, p. 350.

[118] For an exhaustive study, see G. A. Boyle, *op. cit.*

[119] *J. M. G. C. (1910)*, pp. 107-109, 374.

[120] *Ibid.*, pp. 108-109, 374-375.

[121] H. L. Smith, "Borden Parker Bowne: Heresy at Boston," *American Religious Heretics*, G. H. Shriver, ed (Nashville, 1966), pp. 148-179.

[122] *J. M. G. C. (1914)*, pp. 91, 119, 312.

[123] J. H. Riddell, *op. cit.*, p. 314. W. H. Alexander, "In the Beginning," *Alberta Historical Review*, VIII, 2, 1960, pp. 15-20. P. E. Weston, "A University for Calgary," *Alberta Historical Review*, XI, 3, 1963, pp. 1-11.

[124] J. E. Murray, "The Provincial Capitol Controversy in Saskatchewan," *Saskatchewan History*, V, 1952, pp. 81-105. E. H. Oliver, "The University of Saskatchewan," 1910, reprinted *Saskatchewan History*, XII, 1959, pp. 72-73. J. F. C. Wright, *Saskatchewan, The History of a Province*, (Toronto, 1955), pp. 140-141. J. E. Murray, "The Early History of Emmanual College," *Saskatchewan History*, IX, 1956, pp. 81-101. F. Passmore, "Methodist Memories of Saskatchewan," *Saskatchewan History*, VIII, 1955, pp. 11-16. J. E. Murray, "The Contest for the University of Saskatchewan," *Saskatchewan History*, XII, 1959, pp. 1-22.

[125] M. A. Ormsby, *British Columbia, A History* (Toronto, 1955), pp. 311, 325, 361-362, 389, 402, 418, 426, 438.

[126] *J. M. G. C. (1918)*, pp. 98, 123, 325, 333.

[127] *Ibid. (1922)*, pp. 49-50, 158.

[128] Massey Foundation, *Report of the Massey Foundation Commission on the Secondary Schools and Colleges of the Methodist Church of Canada*, Published by the Massey Foundation with the Authority of the Board of Education of the Methodist Church, 1921, pp. 22-31.

[129] *J. M. G. C. (1910)*, Methodist Church, Board of Education and Executive Committee, Unpublished "Minutes" (Toronto: United Church of Canada Archives, 1906-1910), pp. 50-51.

[130] *J. M. G. C. (1914)*, p. 153; *(1918)*, p. 196; *(1922)*, p. 215.

[131] *Ibid. (1910)*, pp. 189-190, 366.

[132] *Ibid. (1914)*, p. 147; *(1918)*, p. 190; *(1922)*, p. 351. Methodist Church, Board of Education and Executive Committee, Unpublished "Minutes," (1906-1910), pp. 27-29, 31-33, 44-45, 47-49, 82-84, 91-95, 97-99, 106-110, 115-116, 132-136; (1910-1921), pp. 71-72, 83-86, 92-96, 98-99, 126-127.

[133] Methodist Church, Board of Education and Executive Committee, Unpublished "Minutes," (1910-1921), pp. 31-45, 63-65.

[134] *J. M. G. C. (1922)*, pp. 211-212.

[135] S. D. Chown, "Address to the General Conference," *Christian Guardian*, September 13, 1922, p. 11.

[136] *J. M. G. C. (1922)*, p. 207. Methodist Church, Board of Education and Executive Committee, Unpublished "Minutes," (1910-1921), pp. 271-288.

[137] *J. M. G. C. (1918)*, p. 302.

[138] J. S. Woodsworth, "The Training of Our Ministers," *Christian Guardian*, May 25, 1910, pp. 10-11.

[139] *J. M. G. C. (1918)*, pp. 132, 302.

[140] *Ibid. (1922)*, pp. 68, 89, 137-140, 143, 326-328.

[141] *Ibid. (1914)*, pp. 149-150; *(1918)*, p. 193.

[142] S. D. Chown, "Address to the General Conference," *Christian Guardian*, Sept. 13, 1922, pp. 11-15.

[143] *J. M. G. C. (1910)*, pp. 135, 339-340.

[144] *Ibid. (1922)*, pp. 138, 325.

[145] *Ibid. (1910)*, pp. 135, 342-344.

[146] J. M. Magwood, "A Change in Our Theological Curriculum Imperative," *Christian Guardian*, June 3, 1914, pp. 8-9.

[147] *J. M. G. C. (1914)*, pp. 117, 288-291.

[148] F. N. Stapleford, "The Minister and His Training," *Christian Guardian*,

[149] *J. M. G. C. (1918)*, pp. 132, 302-303.

[150] *Ibid. (1922)*, pp. 68, 89, 137-140, 143, 326-328.

[151] *Ibid. (1910)*, pp. 342-344.

[152] *Ibid. (1914)*, pp. 117-118, 291-292.

[153] *Ibid. (1922)*, pp. 138-139, 328.

[154] *Ibid. (1910)*, 338.

[155] *Ibid. (1980)*, pp. 237-240.

[156] *Ibid. (1922)*, p. 209.

[157] *Ibid. (1894)*, pp. 181-182.

[158] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

[159] *Ibid. (1906)*, pp. 352-353. J. H. Riddell, *op. cit.*, pp. 271-275.

[160] *J. M. G. C. (1910)*, p. 190.

[161] D. C. Masters, *Protestant Church Colleges in Canada* (Toronto, 1966), pp. 167, 205-206.

[162] *J. M. G. C. (1914)*, pp. 163-170. F. Passmore, "Methodist Memories of Saskatchewan," *Saskatchewan History*, VIII, 1955, pp. 11-16. D. C. Masters, *op. cit.*, pp. 166, 205.

[163] Estimated from figures in *J. M. G. C. (1922)*, pp. 423-424.

CHAPTER IV

THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH

Congregationalism was first introduced into the Maritimes by settlers from New England following the expulsion of the Acadians. Congregationalism was then, as it had been since the arrival of the Puritans in the 1620's, the dominant religious power in New England. Indeed it was still riding the crest of the early eighteenth century revival since referred to as the "Great Awakening" and, of course, experiencing the tensions that always accompany religious revivals.[1]

Many Anglicans in the Maritimes anticipated that the settlers, weary of these tensions, would be absorbed by the Established Church but their hopes were disappointed. Congregationalism grew rapidly in the towns and villages because of the suitability of its polity and the rallying point it provided in the struggle against the metropolitanism of Halifax. This success, however, ended with the American Revolution. The close association of New England Congregationalism with the Revolution[2] cast suspicion of treason upon the Maritime Congregationalists, wartime economic conditions ruined the class that had provided the main financial support and leadership for the church, and the ideology of Congregationalism was simply irrelevant to the disturbed social conditions of the times. Most of the membership drifted into the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches and there remained, even after the return of more stable conditions. By 1800 fewer than six Congregationalist churches remained open.[3]

In 1842 three missionaries sponsored by the English Congregational "Colonial Missionary Society" arrived in the Maritimes. They and their work were, of course, above suspicions of treason, but they faced well entrenched competition. Meanwhile Congregationalist missionaries had also been sent to Lower and Upper Canada in 1801 and 1819 respectively. Despite assistance from England, British North American Congregationalism did not flourish because of stiff competition from other denominations, the nature of its polity, and the relatively meagre additions to its strength through immigration.[4]

Congregationalism was dedicated to two principles. In emphasizing that the church be identifiable by the quality of life of its members, it refused to adopt a creed as the measure of orthodoxy. Basically Calvinist in theology, it held distinctive views on the nature of the church, relations between church and state, and the role of creeds. Such was the substance of the 1658 "Savoy Declaration" issued by the English Independents in criticism of the Presbyterian "Westminster Confession." Second, the English Congregationalists vested all authority concerning religious matters in the local congregation. However this independence bore a heavy burden of isolation and "associations" or "unions" based on geographic regions were gradually adopted. Some forty of these were formed in the period 1781 and 1845.[5] American Congregationalism held similar views but did not turn to regional associations until after 1846.[6]

The English influence was evident in the organization of regional Congregational "unions" in British North America; Upper

Canada in 1837, Lower Canada in 1839, and in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in 1847. The unions in Ontario and Quebec amalgamated in 1853.[7] In general, these unions, as exemplified by that of Ontario and Quebec, were strictly circumscribed in their functions,

> 1. To promote evangelical religion in connection with the Congregational denomination. 2. To cultivate brotherly affection and cooperation. . . . 3. To establish . . . correspondence with similar bodies elsewhere. 4. To address an annual or an occasional letter to associated churches. . . . 5. To obtain accurate statistical information. . . . 6. To hold consultation on questions of interest, . . . [and was] expressly forbidden to assume legislative or administrative authority or to serve as a court of appeal.[8]

By 1900 it was apparent that reorganization on a wider scale if not even of a different nature was necessary. Hence the 1902 proposal of a union of the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational churches was greeted warmly. Prior to the selection of delegates to the Joint Committee on Union, the Congregational paper editorialized,

> The [union] idea proposed has grown and spread with wondrous unanimity. . . . No person of influence nor any religious organ but approves heartily. . . . We must be prepared at the [Congregational] Union [meeting] to do all we can to help on the union of churches.[9]

However a union of such magnitude would require time, so the Congregationalists turned in the interim to the union of the regional "associations" or "unions" in Canada. Precedents for National "unions" were numerous--Scotland (1812), Ireland (1829), England and Wales (1829), the United States (1871), South Africa (1877), and New Zealand (1883).[10] In 1906 the Congregational Union of Ontario and Quebec united with that of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to form the Congregational Union of Canada.[11] The following year the Union was joined by the United Brethren in

Christ.[12] The usual practice of regional "associations" was disregarded and a "United Brethren Association of Congregational Churches" was created to permit these new members to retain their practices of itinerant ministers and a superintendency. Such practices were repugnant to the Congregationalists but on all other points they held common views.[13]

The Congregational Union of Canada in 1907 had 9,598 members scattered from coast to coast, and congregations in all provinces save Prince Edward Island. Its sole foreign missionary undertaking was in Africa, and it was in correspondence with Congregational Unions in several other countries.[14]

Congregationalist interest in union at the denominational and interdenominational levels stemmed from an awareness that it was contributing little to the overall mission of Christianity and as an institution was in a state of serious decline. Indeed the percentage of Congregationalists in the Canadian population had declined from 0.63 to 0.53 between the census of 1871 and 1901.[15] Some attributed this to problems of attitude and failure to meet urban needs,

> Canadian Congregationalism lacks proper pride . . . as a denomination, . . . generosity . . . , and fellowship and cooperation in denominational work. . . . There is a strange reluctance in church and ministers . . . to use evangelistic methods--open air preaching, special meetings, . . . institutional work, in reaching after the unchurched.[16]

This lack of urban activity stood in sharp contrast to the deep involvement of the British and American Congregational churches.[17] Others saw the problem as related to the West; one Saskatchewan missionary stated it as follows,

> In this district there are no less than fifteen different denominations represented, twelve of which . . . meet together whenever possible. . . . Leaders of three great denominations . . . meet at a "Hague Conference" of religious powers away down east, to determine how best to avoid wasteful expenditure of forces and funds, . . . meanwhile the superintendents, convenors and others in command at the front are so disposing their forces that sometimes half-a-dozen men are scrambling over each other in a vain attempt to establish as many isms among a handful of settlers. . . .[18]

No serious misgivings were expressed concerning the unions of 1906 and 1907, but there were many concerning the larger union proposal. The Rev. J. L. Gordon of Winnipeg expressed them concisely in a 1908 address reported in *The Congregationalist*.

> . . . First, said Mr. Gordon, we sacrifice our own distinctive principle, the independence of the local church. . . . Secondly, we have very little to contribute, only 125 churches with about 10,000 members, . . . Thirdly we cannot go into the Union as an organic whole. . . . Fourthly, there will always be an independent Church . . . [to serve the] incoming wave of Congregationalists from the Motherland and the States. . . . [Fifth] perhaps with the development of . . . a power church such as the United Church of Canada, we may need an Independent church. [Sixth] , . . . with the assistance of our friends in Great Britain, we have paid our debts. . . . Before . . . any Union, in the name of common justice we should have to return every penny. . . . Seventh, while we are discussing Church Union . . . church extension is being paralyzed . . . . Eighthly . . . I crave the privilege of uttering the convictions of my own soul . . .
>
> But having said all this, . . . the future of Canada [appeals to me and] if this Union is to help in the development of the best of this country, then I am with it. . . .[19]

However the key issue was "freedom of thought" and this had been so treated by the Joint Union Committee that the 1910 Congregational vote on the Proposed Basis of Union registered strong support.[20]

Meanwhile the Congregationalists actively engaged in a variety of cooperative activities to compensate for their denominational weaknesses. From its formation in 1907 the Moral and Social

Reform Council received the support of individual Congregationalists and this support became denominational in 1911.[21] In 1912 they entered into a "Cooperation Agreement" with the Methodists and Presbyterians by which competition in the West was reduced through the pooling of resources and effort, and by the assignment of territories to reduce overlap. However this was only partially successful.[22]

Cooperative college work was also undertaken in 1912 and will be considered in more detail later in this chapter.

Meanwhile the Congregationalists became increasingly aware that their base of support in the villages and rural areas of eastern Canada was failing as the church was unable to cope with the effects of rural depopulation. In *The Canadian Congregationalist*, Professor Lochead wrote,

> The condition of the rural communities of the older provinces of Canada is giving considerable anxiety . . . [as] a great movement from the country to the city has taken place. . . . The loss of so many members . . . has left the country districts disorganized socially, intellectually, and spiritually. . . .
>
> Rural schools . . . and churches require redirection. . . .
>
> The multiplicity of rural churches . . . hinders cooperation . . . [yet] the task of the country church is to unify the community. . . . A readjustment of the Church to the community is as necessary as readjustment . . . to each other. . . .[23]

The 1914-1918 War not only accelerated this trend but eroded Congregationlist strength everywhere as men enlisted into the armed services. Particularly serious was the loss of ministers to the chaplaincy and the reduction of candidates for the ministry. Nor did the return of peace bring any appreciable relief. By 1921 the Congregationalist percentage of the population had dropped to

0.35.[24] The rate of decline in the period 1901-1921 was almost triple that of 1871-1901.

However serious decline was not limited to Canadian Congregationalism. Both British[25] and American[26] Congregationalism had declined. The difference was that they had gone from strength to weakness whereas Canadian Congregationalism had gone from weakness to a condition of near oblivion.

The long wait of the Canadian Congregationalists came to an end with the Union of June 10, 1925.

I. CONGREGATIONAL POLICIES (1906 - 1925)

As in previous chapters the policy areas to be considered will be those of the ministry and the colleges during the years when the church had achieved an organizational form that coincided with the national boundaries.

The Ministry

The "Constitution" of the Congregational Union of Canada,[27] identical to that of the old Congregational Union of Ontario and Quebec which had been largely copied from that of the Congregational Union of England and Wales,[28] outlined the procedures for admitting members to its Union and in so doing indicated the requirements for the ministry. These included membership in a Congregational church, training at least comparable to that of the Congregational College of Canada, and ordination which was, of course, a responsibility of the local congregation. Ministers from other denominations had to satisfy the Union "Membership Committee" that the training requirement had been satisfied, that they held doctrinal and polity views congenial to the Union, and that they were in "good standing" in the denomination which they were leaving. In addition, a year's probation was required after which membership could be granted by a two-thirds affirmative vote of those present at the Union meeting. The Union of 1907 did not require any modification of this as the differing practices of the United Brethren in Christ were matters of administrative preference rather than doctrine. Moreover these practices were discarded in 1919 when the United Brethren and Western Ontario Associations were amalgamated.[29]

Character requirements were covered by church membership. The quality of life expected of the clergy and laity was the same; their differences were in functions within the church for which the clergy had been specially trained and ordained. Such were also the views and practices of British and American Congregationalism.[30]

As ministers, like laymen, were traditionally responsible to the local congregations, the formation of the regional and later the national bodies raised questions as to their responsibilities regarding the clergy. The matter was considered by a "Reorganization Committee" in 1907 and, after much debate, responsibility for the ordination and installation of ministers was assigned to the regional associations. Efforts to include powers "to discipline, suspend or depose" ministers met such resistance that they were left with the congregations, though with the recommendation that they be exercised only in consultation with the Associations. The discipline of the laity remained with the congregations.[31] This closely resembled the arrangements of the western American associations adopted in the 1880's[32] whereas the English Congregational constitution of 1904 assigned these responsibilities regarding ministers to the national Union.[33]

In 1910 a "Model Association Constitution" was adopted defining Association responsibilities. All students for the ministry, like ministers, would be responsible to the associations. Ministers, upon request, would be assisted in changing pastorates, in reorganizing or modifying pastoral field work, or in resolving difficulties within the congregations. Upon request from the congregations, the associations would examine candidates for the ministry, examine and certify the credentials of ministers seeking employment, and participate in the ordination or installation of ministers.[34] After some resistance in 1912 it became a "Standing Rule" in 1913 that the Union rather than the regional Associations would issue documentation for ministers moving to other denominations or to Congregational bodies in other countries.[35] Disturbed by evidence of financial difficulties among the clergy,[36] the Executive recommended to the 1914 Union meeting the establishment of a minimum salary. The proposal was rejected but it was "recommended to the Associations to take such action as might be best fitted to their localities."[37] In effect, rejection was more for the role assumed by the Union and its Executive than for the proposal itself. Time proved this approach to be ineffective. Significant relief was afforded the clergy only when the Union was able to create an "Augmentation Fund" in 1920 with proceeds from the Forward Movement, thereby guaranteeing a minimum salary and a free manse.[38] Meanwhile the Union had received the right in 1916 to request and receive statements of their activities for all ministers collecting money from the public.[39]

Strangely, the issue of ordaining women was never raised at meetings of the Canadian Congregational Union or in the church papers, although it had been started in 1889 and was widespread by 1894 in American Congregationalism.[40] The British Congregationalists began to ordain women in 1917.[41]

In general the Congregationalists remained consistent in their view of the ministry throughout the period although, as will be seen later, they were forced to compromise in terms of the level of training for the ministry. Their main achievement was the division of responsibilities regarding the ministry to increase its effectiveness. The Union acquired responsibilities best served by centralization, the Associations acquired those best served by proximity and direct knowledge, and the residue remained with the local congregations.

The Colleges

Canadian Congregationalism began its college work in the 1830's and was primarily influenced by the British as ties with the American church had long been broken. Nevertheless the Canadians were aware of the American experience and practice.

The Americans had initiated their college program with the founding of Harvard in 1639 and had supplemented it over the years with numerous preparatory "academies" and other colleges and universities. The "defection" of Harvard to Unitarianism in 1805 sparked a trend toward the opening of more specifically theological colleges: Andover (1808), Bangor (1816), Yale (1822), Hartford (1833), Oberlin (1835), Chicago (1854), and Pacific (1869). As these grew in effectiveness, the Congregationalists became less concerned about denominational control of their other institutions. In time they adopted the practice of permitting candidates for the ministry to undertake preparatory studies at any academically respectable institution so long as theological studies were completed in a Congregational theological college.[42]

The history of English Congregational college work is confused by the number of institutions (some sixty were opened between 1660 and 1750) and their often early demise because of persecution, lack of funds, or lack of leadership. Such as survived experienced a bewildering number of unions. In general they offered both general and theological programs as the universities were closed to non-Anglicans until 1871. Thereafter the Congregationalists converted their colleges to strictly theological institutions and consciously located them in centers where students could obtain their preparatory studies and, in some cases, additional theological studies at neighbouring institutions.[43]

Considering the decline of Congregational strength in both Britain and the United States and the rising cost of general studies, there was no viable alternative.

Canadian Congregationalism, in 1906, could claim but one college, "The Canadian Congregational College" in Montreal. This was the combined results of three earlier educational undertakings.

The earliest of these was the "Congregational Academy" of Toronto founded in 1840 after tentative beginnings in Brantford and Dundas. The second was the "Theological Institute," founded in 1842 in Montreal. Both institutions were strongly encouraged and largely financed by the Congregational "Colonial Missionary Society" in England. Substantial reductions in this support forced the institutions to amalgamate in 1846 in Toronto under the name of the "Canadian Congregational Theological Institute." Control of the college passed with the financial burden to the Canadian supporters and so matters rested until 1860.[44]

Finally there was "Gorham College" founded in 1848 in Liverpool, Nova Scotia. Congregationalism there had overcome its 1759 New England origins by reason of the notably successful leadership provided by several of its members in privateering ventures against American shipping during and after the Revolution. Profits from these ventures provided the basis for several large family fortunes. Part of the Gorham family fortune was devoted to founding the College. English Congregationalism became identified with the college through support given by the Colonial Missionary Society and the direction it gave to the affairs of the college. Additional financial support was provided by the Quebec Congregationalists. The excellent program and facilities attracted a student body from the Maritimes, Quebec, and even New England. In 1854 the college was almost totally destroyed by fire. After considerable quarrelling, it was decided in 1860 to transfer the remaining funds and the remnants of the library to the Toronto institute which then took the name of "The Congregational College of British North America."[45]

In 1864, amid vicious controversy,[46] the college was moved to Montreal to enable the students to benefit through association with McGill University.[47] A permanent building was acquired on the campus in 1884 and incorporation as the "Canadian Congregational College" in 1889.[48] Plans were prepared in 1913 for another college to be built on the University of British Columbia campus in Vancouver. These featured a cooperative faculty arrangement similar to that of the Montreal college.[49] The war, post-war conditions, and the impending union, however, forestalled any further action and Congregationalism entered the 1925 union with one college.

As Congregationalism lacked a central administration, the college, like other enterprises, was the responsibility of a "corporation." In 1899 the College Corporation had adopted "By-laws" which were retained until the Union of 1925. The By-laws provided for representation in the corporation and for its meetings, for the election of the Board of Governors and the Senate, and for the appointment of Faculty. It also outlined the duties of these bodies and the course of study to be offered.[50]

Financial responsibility was delegated to the Board of Governors. As there was only one Congregational College in Canada and because of its roots in both central provinces and in the Maritimes, the Board felt justified in directing its appeals to the congregations throughout the country. Support was solicited for annual current expenses, a General Endowment Fund, and for a variety of particular interests such as the library or residence furnishings.[51] To identify its activities with the unions, the Corporation regularly met at the same times and places and published its reports in the *Yearbook*. However it was early evident that the college was short of both funds and students. In 1905 the Union of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick urged the ministers to encourage their congregations to support the college.[52] Despite the ineffectiveness of such pleas and resolutions, they were all that was permitted by the polity of the time and this polity was retained by the unions of 1906 and 1907. By 1909 the lack of support for the college and other societies led to the adoption of the "apportionment plan." By this, the executive of the Union would inform each regional association of its fair share of the financial burden of the various societies. Hopefully the circulation of this information through the *Yearbook* and the denominational paper would stir a positive response.[53]

At this point the Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian colleges embarked upon a cooperative faculty experiment. Each college would offer specifically denominational courses for their own students and the portion of the less denominational courses, such as Biblical languages, to the students of all three colleges. So obvious were the educational and financial advantages that the Anglican college began to participate in 1912 and a "Joint Board of the Theological Colleges affiliated with McGill University" was incorporated in 1913.[54] The arrangement was loudly acclaimed in the Congregational press.[55]

However the apportionment plan was disappointing in its results. Indeed, in 1915 when the college faculty had been reduced to one member, the College Corporation still found itself in need of funds and so proposed the establishment of a Union "financial committee" to promote the apportionment plan. Such, however, was too radical a solution and the proposal was rejected.[56] The following year and thereafter the Congregationalists added to their contribution to the cooperative college work by the employment of part-time lecturers.[57] A measure of relief came in 1918 when the Presbyterian students moved into the residence, a move made necessary by the temporary use of their residence by the government as a military hospital,[58] and the proceeds of the 1920 Forward Movement made possible long needed repairs to the Congregational College building and the employment of a second faculty member.[59] Thus matters rested until the 1925 Union.

The financial policy of the college was a failure. The early voluntarism did not produce sufficient revenue and the apportionment plan which was used from 1909 to 1925 did not increase revenues significantly. In its sixteen years of use, the funds received were between thirty and sixty per cent of the objective in all years except one. To be sure, the college remained open and men received training, but only because of arrangements with outsiders, the reduction of activities, the decision not to build in the West, and fortuitous events. The greater success in college financing experienced by both British and American Congregationalism can be attributed to their early formation of societies or boards for the purpose of raising funds for the extension, and continued support of their college work,[60] their earlier "national" organization which fostered a sense of mission to their respective countries, and the vastly larger constituencies from which they could draw support.

The objective of Canadian Congregational recruitment was to obtain and train sufficient men to fill the pulpits within the framework of a partial supply from Britain and despite a leakage of men to the United States.

The astonishing aspect is that student recruitment was never clearly designated as a responsibility of the college corporation or any of its related bodies,[61] the national Union,[62] or the regional Associations.[63] Thus it remained in Canadian, like American Congregationalism,[64] a congregational responsibility. In contrast the British, in 1904, made it a specific responsibility of their National Council.[65]

The failure of Congregational recruitment policy is reflected in the reliance on students from England[66] and the repeated pleas for more Canadian students.[67] Indeed the decline in enrollment caused by the war was so critical that pastors were urged to recruit candidates from among boys below the age of military service, the physically unfit, and convalescent veterans.[68] Considering the strenuous nature of pastoral work, especially in rural and frontier situations, this was a solution born of desperation. Congregational hopes that large numbers of veterans would enter the ministry after the war were disappointed, although most of those who had been enrolled as candidates before enlistment did return to complete their studies.[69] Similarly great expectations were held for the results of the Forward Movement and, while there was a slight increase in student enrollment, it was far short of the church's needs.[70] Indeed the college graduated 187 men in the period 1841 to 1925, a yearly average of 2.22 but the period of united Congregationalism, 1907 to 1925, saw only 28 graduates, an annual average of 1.25.[71]

The failure of Congregationalism to expand or even maintain the number of its ministers was paralleled in the membership of the congregations. In 1925 there were eighty Congregational churches in Quebec and Ontario of which only ten had memberships exceeding two hundred, and twenty-seven with less than fifty members. Of the fifty churches west of Ontario, only two exceeded two hundred members, while forty-one had less than fifty members. Of the seventeen Maritime congregations, twelve had less than fifty members and only one, a union congregation served by a Methodist, reached above one hundred members. Both phenomena were caused by the same problem. By reason of the circumstances of its introduction into Canada and its organization, Congregationalism could have been expected to adopt a sectarian ideology but this was prevented by its theological position which similarly prevented adoption of a conservative ideology. Moreover few Congregationalists were in such circumstances as to be inclined in this direction. Congregationalism in Canada was basically social-reformist in ideology but its polity prohibited any organization that would have made it effective in this role. Hence the continual drain of its people, ministers, and candidates for the ministry into other churches.

Those that remained in the vast majority entered the Union of 1925. Of those that did not, one element moved into denominations practicing a Congregational type polity and having a clearly sectarian ideology, while the remainder moved into denominations such as the continuing Presbyterians which were basically conservative in ideology although this required some adjustment to non-Congregational polity.[72]

In the area of curriculum, the Congregationalists had two serious problems: the maintenance of high academic standards in the face of pressure from the congregations to prepare men in haste to meet the perpetual shortage of ministers, and to provide adequate training in the face of the variable quality of those presenting themselves for the ministry.

The latter difficulty was met with a variety of programs of preparation for the ministry. The standard course was of three years' duration leading to the degree Bachelor of Divinity, and was open to candidates possessing an Arts degree from a recognized university. There was a problem, however, in that few candidates were able to obtain the prerequisite degree.[73] The College also offered a Diploma which would be obtained in a variety of ways. It was awarded to students with B.A. degrees and two years of theology, or to students having completed five years of combined general and theological studies at McGill and the College, or to students with one year of Arts and three years of theology. Both of these programs presupposed actual or near university entrance educational background. Such as lacked this, but showed "fitness for the ministry" upon recommendation from the Home Missionary Society or an Association, could be admitted to a certificate course. In addition to the above, the College had a "literary curriculum" to raise all non-B.A. candidates to the level of matriculation and second year of a B.A. program. As to the other problem, while the college could not prevent the use of inadequately prepared men in pastoral work, it sought to remedy their defects by a "reading course."

The Bachelor of Divinity or B.D. course of united Congregationalism was an inheritance of the college corporation reorganization of 1899.[74] The course was of three years' duration. Courses taken in each of the years were Greek, Hebrew, Apologetics, Church History, and Biblical Theology. In addition there were courses in each of New Testament Introduction, Pastoral Theology, and Church Government, and two courses in Theology. With few changes, this program remained the standard until 1925. In 1906 supplemental lectures in Sociology and Elocution were added to the B.D. program.[75] The merit of sociology in ministerial education had already been established in American Congregationalism.[76] In 1909 the Hebrew requirement was reduced to two years with the third remaining as an option.[77] The last changes occurred in 1922 when credits for work toward the degree became dependent upon the decision of the Faculty of the Federated Colleges, rather than the individual professors, and a thesis, the topic of which required Faculty approval, became a degree requirement.[78] In effect the B.D. program became more rigorous and its "scholarly" emphasis was supplemented by what were sometimes considered "practical" studies in Elocution and Sociology.

The Diploma program, as outlined in 1899,[79] differed in terms of admission standards rather than in the course itself.

Students were required to obtain standard equal to second year B.A. through the Literary Course. This was reduced in 1904 to little more than first year B.A.[80] The theology requirements were those of the B.D. program until 1909 when Hebrew became optional to all but B.D. students[81] and the 1922 thesis requirement did not apply to Diploma students. Thus the cleavage between the two programs was widened.

The 1899 outline of programs of study made no mention of a course for men in the field nor of any possible need for such a course. This changed by 1904 as Congregationalism moved into western Canadian work and the newly formed Western Association found great difficulty in supplying men for its pulpits. Hence the request for a "reading course" for men in the field. Such had, of course, been successfully used by the Methodists for years. The College agreed to prepare such a course and to direct studies on an individual basis until the course was ready. However it was stipulated that field studies would not be considered equivalent to the College courses, but were simply "a help and guide to individual effort."[82] The following year additional support from other Associations for such a program appeared. The College repeated its views on the limitations of such a program but announced that such would be available to "ministers of the denomination and any other person who may be recommended by an Association."[83] In effect the College had stated its criticisms of such a program but it would, as it was able, assist men in the field with their education but the responsibility for the results of men taking the program was squarely laid upon the Associations which recommended these men and in which they would work.

The results of the institution of the course were disappointing. No one enrolled.[84] Yet such could have been expected. The College refused to recognize formally work done in the program, the churches were reluctant to make it a condition of employment, and possible participants were unable to obtain definite statements as to the quantity or quality of work required. All of this was corrected in time. In 1909 a list of the unordained preachers, known as Evangelists and Lay Pastors, was added to the *Yearbook*.[85] This gave a measure of standing to such workers and incentive to the Associations to employ men who would be suitable in the sight of the wider church. In the same year the Home Mission Society announced the employment of two men who would be taking a two year reading course.[86] In this limited way and by implication only, study became a condition of employment. A major breakthrough occurred in 1913 when the College announced the ordination of three men who had completed programs of study while employed in field work.[87] It was thus established that whatever the views of the College, ordination was possible upon completion of a program of study in the field. The following year the college finally issued a definitive reading program of three years duration. Students in the program were to be supervised by neighbouring pastors.[88] The wide acceptance of the course by the Associations reflected the growing difficulty of filling the available pulpits.

The content of the reading course was reviewed in 1916 and 1922.[89] It originally consisted of readings from some twenty volumes concerning Old and New Testament, Church History, Theology, Christian Ethics, Missions, Christian Education, Church Polity, Christian Devotions, and Preaching. The revisions placed a greater emphasis on Church History and added English Composition. While wide in scope, it was obvious, as stated by the College, that this could not be equated with the College programs, Degree or Diploma.

As to the relationship of the church and the College, nothing beyond participation in the Apportionment Plan was ever achieved. This was similar to the English Congregational experience.[90]

The Congregationalist policies in regard to both the ministry and the college underwent change because of severe pressures. Those policies affecting the ministry were more effective. To be sure this was at the cost of traditional practices but the ministers were able to continue their work even if in organization somewhat approximating a Presbyterian "Presbytery" or a Methodist "District." College policy changes proved to be less succesful: financies remained inadequate, enrollment continued to decline, curriculum modifications included the "Reading Course" which was an educational disaster, and church-college relations remained unimproved. Yet Congregational polity was not sufficiently flexible to permit significant changes to improve the situation; the pride of Congregationalism was the cord by which the College was being strangled. The people closely connected with the College recognized this, and seeing no alternative solution than a radically modified polity, became stalwart proponents of church union.[91]

FOOTNOTES

[1] W. Walker, *A History of the Congregationalist Churches in the United States* (New York, 1894), pp. 66-308. W. W. Sweet, *The Story of Religion in America* (New York, 1930, 1950), pp. 128-137. K. S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York, 1953), pp. 953, 957-960. E. S. Gaustad, *A Religious History of America* (New York, 1966), pp. 47-63.

[2] A. E. Dunning, *Congregationalists in America* (New York, 1894), pp. 265-276. W. W. Sweet, *op. cit.*, pp. 176-178.

[3] S. D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada* (Toronto, 1948), pp. 3-89. H. H. Walsh, *The Christian Church in Canada* (Toronto, 1946), pp. 92-98, 117-132.

[4] J. Brown, *The Colonial Missions of Congregationalism* (London, 1908), p. 41. W. T. Gunn, *His Dominion* (Toronto, 1917), pp. 96-99. C. E. Silcox, *Church Union in Canada* (New York, 1933), pp. 20, 41-42.

[5] E. Routley, *The Story of Congregationalism* (London, 1961), pp. 8-57, 66-69. J. W. Grant, *Free Churchmanship in England* (London, N.D., c. 1951), pp. 1-19.

[6] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-163, 206-208. M. M. Deems, "The Congregational Christian Churches," *The American Church of the Protestant Heritage*, ed. V. Fern (New York, 1953), p. 176.

[7] J. Brown, *op. cit.* pp. 31-32, 41.

[8] Congregational Church, *Yearbook (1906-07)*, pp. 22-23; hereinafter cited as *Yearbook*.

[9] *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XI, 19 (May 12, 1904), p. 3.

[10] E. Routley, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-78, 150-154, 159-160. W. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 394-412.

[11] *Yearbook (1905-06)*, p. 69.

[12] *Ibid. (1906-07)*, pp. 45-50.

[13] J. W. Scholfield, "The Harmonization of United Brethren Usages with Congregational Principles, *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XIV, 3 (July 25, 1909), pp. 10-12.

[14] *Yearbook (1907-08)*, pp. 8, 21, 111.

[15] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, p. 477.

[16] A. E. Prior, "Canadian Congregationalism Again," *The Canadian Congregationalist*, VII, 33 (August 15, 1901), pp. 4-5.

[17] J. W. Grant, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-182. K. S. Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age*, III, The Nineteenth Century Outside Europe (New York, 1961), pp. 223-233. W. S. Hudson, *American Protestantism* (Chicago, 1961), pp. 140-142.

[18] A. E. Cooke, "Meanwhile . . .?" *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XIV, 52 (October 17, 1907), pp. 10-11.

[19] J. L. Gordon, "Western Congregationalism vs. Church Union," *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XV, 19 (May 7, 1908), pp. 6-7.

[20] *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XVII, 15 (April 14, 1910), p. 4; XVII, 22 (June 2, 1910), p. 13.

[21] S. Crysdale, *The Industrial Struggle and Protestant Ethics in Canada* (Toronto, 1961), pp. 24-25, 86-87.

[22] W. T. Gunn, "Our Home Missions Progress for 1908," *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XV, 6 (February 6, 1908), pp. 6-7. *Yearbook (1911-12)*, p. 121. *The Canadian Congregationalist*, "Mission Cooperation: A Plan Outlined," XVIII, 12 (March 23, 1911), pp. 8-9.

[23] Professor Lochead, "The Church and the Rural Community," *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XX, 49 (December 4, 1913), pp. 9-11; 50 (December 11, 1913), pp. 8-10; 51 (December 18, 1913), pp. 10-11.

[24] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*p. 477.

[25] E. Routley, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-86, 89.

[26] A. E. Dunning, *op. cit.*, pp. 411-412. W. W. Sweet, *op. cit.* pp. 391-392, 400-415.

[27] *Yearbook (1907-08)*, pp. 23-27.

[28] H. H. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 220-221.

[29] *Yearbook (1906-07)*, pp. 45-50; *(1919-20)*, p. 20.

[30] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 220-226. J. W. Grant, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-62, 157-162.

[31] *Yearbook (1907-08)*, p. 54.

[32] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 392-394.

[33] J. W. Grant, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-189.

[34] *Yearbook (1909-10)*, pp. 28-37; *(1910-11)*, pp. 47-52.

[35] *Ibid. (1912-15)*, pp. 24, 43; *(1912-15)*, pp. 24, 43; *(1913-14)*, pp. 12, 21.

[36] *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XX (1913).

[37] *Yearbook (1914-15)*, pp. 22, 47.

[38] *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XXVI, 24 (June 24, 1920), p. 1.

[39] *Yearbook (1916-17)*, p. 14.

[40] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 424-426.

[41] E. Routley, *op. cit.*, pp. 98-99.

[42] E. Dunning, *op. cit.*, pp. 363-392. W. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 346-365, 388-390, 392, 425. K. S. Latourette, *op. cit.*, pp. 153-165.

[43] E. Routley, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-125.

[44] *The Canadian Independent*, XI, 1 (July, 1864), pp. 22-23. J. Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-51.

[45] G. M. Rogers, "The Story of a Nova Scotia College (Gorham College)," *Dalhousie Review*, XVIII (1938), pp. 494-512. H. W. Barker, "The Liverpool Congregational Church and Gorham College," (c. 1945), Ms., United Church Archives, pp. 237-261.

[46] *The Canadian Independent*, X (1863); XI (1864).

[47] J. Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-52.

[48] Congregational College of Canada, *A Short History and a Plea*, Pmaphlet (1921), pp. 2-8.

[49] *Yearbook (1914-15)*, p. 127; *The Canadian Congregationalist*, "New School of Theology," XX, 10 (April 7, 1913), pp. 5-7.

[50] *Yearbook (1899-1900)*, pp. 153-159.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[52] *Ibid. (1905-06)*, p. 72.

[53] *Ibid. (1909-10)*, pp. 26-28.

[54] *Ibid.*, pp. 166-167; *(1913-14)*, pp. 129-130.

[55] *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XIX, 27, 37, 42 (1912).

[56] *Yearbook (1915-16)*, pp. 80-81.

[57] *Ibid. (1916-17)*, pp. 75-76.

[58] *Ibid.* *(1917-18)*, p. 79; *(1918-19)*, pp. 82-83.

[59] *Ibid.* *(1920-21)*, pp. 84-85.

[60] E. Routley, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-116. W. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 326-327.

[61] *Yearbook (1899-1900)*, pp. 153-155.

[62] *Ibid.* *(1906-07)*, pp. 22-26.

[63] *Ibid.* *(1909-1910)*, pp. 28-34.

[64] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 202-204, 208, 393.

[65] E. Routley, *op. cit.*, p. 7. J. W. Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

[66] *Yearbook (1907-08)*, p. 158; *(1908-09)*, p. 159; *(1909-1910)*, p. 163; *(1921-22)*, p. 99; *(1924)*, p. 95; *(1925)*, p. 94.

[67] *Ibid.* *(1908-09)*, p. 160; *(1909-10)*, p. 163; *(1913-14)*, p. 132; *(1918-19)*, p. 85; *(1920-21)*, p. 85; *(1921-22)*, pp. 98-99; *(1922)*, pp. 102-103; *(1923)*, p. 99; *(1924)*, p. 95.

[68] W. H. Warriner, "College Sunday--An Appeal," *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XXIV, 30 (October 4, 1917), p. 3. *Yearbook (1918-19)*, p. 85.

[69] *Ibid.* *(1920-21)*, p. 85.

[70] *Ibid.* *(1921-22)*, pp. 12, 97-98.

[71] *Ibid.* *(1925)*, pp. 88-92.

[72] C. E. Silcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 181-185, 272, 313-317.

[73] *Yearbook (1904-05)*, pp. 160-161; *(1907-08)*, p. 157; *(1908-09)*, p. 160; *(1909-10)*, p. 167; *(1913-14)*, p. 132.

[74] *Ibid.* *(1899-1900)*, pp. 155-158.

[75] *Ibid.* *(1906-07)*, pp. 167-168.

[76] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 423-424.

[77] *Yearbook (1909-10)*, p. 167.

[78] *Ibid.* *(1922)*, p. 102.

[79] *Ibid.* *(1899-1900)*, p. 155.

[80] *Ibid.* *(1904-05)*, p. 155.

[81] *Ibid. (1909-10)*, p. 167.

[82] *Ibid. (1905-06)*, p. 153.

[83] *Ibid. (1906-07)*, pp. 57, 170.

[84] *Ibid. (1906-09)*, p. 161; *(1909-10)*, p. 166.

[85] *Ibid. (1909-10)*, pp. 36-37.

[86] *Ibid.*, p. 166.

[87] *Ibid. (1913-14)*, p. 131.

[88] *Ibid. (1914-15)*, p. 22.

[89] *Ibid. (1916-17)*, p. 16; *(1922)*, pp. 16-17.

[90] J. W. Grant, *op. cit.*, pp. 311-312.

[91] *Yearbook (1906-07)*, p. 213; *(1923)*, p. 98; *(1925)*, p. 94.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The preceding chapters have examined the policies pertaining to the ministry and the training of ministers in Canadian Presbyterianism, Methodism, and Congregationalism from the time when each of these denominations achieved unity at the national level until they entered into a common union in 1925. The union of each denomination and the changes in its policies have been viewed in the context of international trends in religion in terms of denominational relations and Christian scholarship, and in the context of the major trends or influences in Canadian society. There remains the task of drawing together the areas of change in the three churches and examining the manner in which they contributed to the union of 1925 which was a joint effort to solve what appeared to be otherwise insoluble problems.

The formation of the three denominational unions did little to suggest that such an interdenominational union would follow. Confederation, with its objective of a nation from sea to sea, played a major role in the Presbyterian and Methodist unions. Earlier unions had brought Presbyterianism to the situation in 1867 of being divided into two parts, each of which was geographically divided between the United Provinces and the Maritimes. Confederation inspired the four parts to begin negotiations for a union that would be better able to serve the religious needs of the new nation. Negotiations were in progress when the Vatican Council met in Rome and issued statements which, coupled with the events at Red River, brought to the surface in virulent form the traditional hostility of Presbyterianism toward Roman Catholicism. This feeling was reinforced by the first meeting of international Presbyterianism which took place in 1875 on the eve of the Presbyterian union. As French Canadian culture was closely identified with Roman Catholicism, it was difficult to distinguish whether the "crusading" aspect of the Presbyterian union was against Roman Catholicism or French Canadianism and this doomed any expectations that Presbyterianism would gain a following in French Canada. It would be, in effect, a church of English-speaking Canada. In most respects the Presbyterian union was achieved without difficulty as the four participating elements were all "church" in experience and attitude.

During this same period the six churches in the Methodist tradition had been similarly engaged in union discussions with the view of creating a church to serve the new nation. While aware of the events that had aroused Presbyterian hostility toward Roman Catholicism, the Methodists were more preoccupied with the idea of a Canadian church free of all associations with churches in other countries which might imply a subordinate status. A union of this character was completed in 1874 but without the participation of the three smaller Methodist groups. The united body retained some "sect" qualities but was far more "church" in form and attitude than the non-participants whose "sect" qualities were now further accentuated. In subsequent years, the three separated churches found themselves unable to adjust to the rural-urban population movements or to extend their work to the West, and the united body found its work hampered by weaknesses in its polity. However, having publicly defended their differences and having assiduously cultivated denominational loyalties, none of the four were prepared to admit to weakness or error, to undertake radical internal reorganization, or to suggest union negotiations. The first Ecumenical Methodist Conference, meeting in London in 1881, offered a solution to the impasse. All branches of Canadian Methodism were represented at the Conference which stressed the fundamental characteristics of Methodism. On the basis of their common heritage, the Canadian Methodists reopened union discussions and, despite the difficulties in uniting organizations having "church" and "sect" orientations, the union of the four was effected in 1884. While the expressed motive of the union of 1884 was to serve Canada, especially through the missionizing of the West, events soon indicated that this was interpreted as the extension of Anglo-Saxon institutions and culture. This precluded any significant relationships with non-English-speaking or non-white racial groups unless there was a willingness upon their part to be assimilated. As assimilation to English-speaking Canadianism was an anathema to French Canada, Methodism became, like Presbyterianism, a church of English-speaking Canada.

The union of Congregationalism did not occur until 1906 and then for different reasons which will be noted in due course. The delay was caused by the continuing conviction in Congregationalism that it had a unique mission to provide a living example of the merit of congregational independence in church life.

Meanwhile the Presbyterians and Methodists were actively pursuing the objectives upon which their respective unions had been based. This involved the reconciliation of differing practices inherited by the unions and the modification of programs to meet changing circumstances. This often caused tensions that had ideological overtones and involved the "conservatives" and the "liberal-reformers." The "orgiastic-chiliasts," by their very nature did not become involved. The "conservative" and "liberal-reformer" tension had figured in the formation of the unions themselves, with the "liberal-reformers" supporting union and the "conservatives" either opposing it or attempting to incorporate in the unions as much as possible of the particular tradition in which they had been nurtured. In later years both positions were modified. The "conservative" position was increasingly taken by people who considered the unions as having successfully met the needs of the times and who considered further change as unnecessary. The "liberal-reformers" became those who felt that the unions had been but a stage in the process of change necessary to meet the changing needs of the times. There were, of course, self-seekers in both camps, those who resisted change lest it jeopardize their comfortable positions, and those who promoted change in the hope of personal advancement.

As parts of world Christianity, it was inevitable that the influences in changing scholarship would be felt by the churches in Canada. The Presbyterian union was still in its first year when controversy erupted over ministers holding modern views that were in conflict with the traditional interpretation of the Westminster

Confession. The issue was resolved by giving recognition to the primacy of Scripture over all creedal statements. From time to time "conservatives" revived the issue by requests for watchdog agencies at the General Assembly or Presbyterial levels but without results. The Methodists were largely untroubled by the problem of the new scholarship until 1910 when it was raised at the General Conference in a manner that threatened the unity of their church. Their solution was to bring into prominence an old article of their polity that gave primacy to Scripture over creedal statements or theological interpretations and to make polity changes which insured the safety of ministers from smear campaigns or rigged trials. Periodic attempts by "conservatives" to circumvent the solution and to impose their views were uniformly unsuccessful. The Congregationalists, both before and after their union, were singularly free from controversy of this nature because they maintained the Congregationalist tradition which had accorded primacy to the Scripture over all creedal statements and interpretations. Therefore the result of controversy over modern scholarship was that, by 1910, the Presbyterians and Methodists had adopted views and practices remarkably similar to those of the Congregationalists.

Both before and after Confederation, Canadian life was strongly influenced by metropolitan centers. The churches were aware of this and both took advantage of it and contributed to it. This was clearly indicated by their choice of locations for their colleges. By reason of their limited numbers and resources, the Congregationalists were early forced to abandon the practice of opening colleges in small centers and to concentrate their efforts in one location. In 1864, a half century before their union, the Congregationalists concentrated all their college activity in Montreal which was then the major city in British North America and a location which made possible an association of the Congregational college with McGill University. In the years following their union, the Congregationalists considered opening a second college to serve their Western work. Their choice of location was Vancouver, which they expected to become the major western center, but circumstances forced cancellation of the plan.

The Presbyterians similarly gave up their early practice of locating colleges in smaller centers in favor of centers having economic or political importance. Presbyterian members and resources permitted them to undertake work in a number of centers and this was extended to the West. The notable exception to the Presbyterian practice was the retention of Queen's University in Kingston after that city had lost its prominence to Toronto, and its later retention and expansion in the face of a government invitation to move it to Toronto where it would become part of a new and powerful educational complex.

The Methodist response to metropolitanism was to locate its colleges, east and west, in major centers and to move Victoria University from Cobourg to Toronto as requested by the Ontario government. However all this was tempered by the practice of retention of institutions in smaller centers, although often with severely restricted functions. The exception to this general practice was Mount Allison University in Sackville, New Brunswick.

This institution was maintained and expanded in a small center and all efforts to attract it to Halifax where it would be associated with Dalhousie University were steadfastly resisted. At the same time the Methodists chose not to open a new institution in Halifax.

The response of these churches to metropolitanism was related to their close identification with English-speaking Canada. The Congregationalists were limited by their resources from multiplying their activities beyond Montreal but it had an influential English-speaking population. The Methodists and Presbyterians continued their efforts there but gradually came to place greater emphasis on their work in Toronto which was emerging as the champion of English-speaking rights. Despite its status as the national capital, Ottawa failed to attract the interest of any of these churches as a college site.

The western frontier posed a variety of challenges to the churches. Extension of their work into large new areas would obviously be costly and the churches all turned to some form of committee or society to raise and disburse funds for the task but, despite heroic efforts, the churches, without exception, found their work hindered by chronic shortages of funds. The problem of local organization and supervision of work in the West was most readily solved by the Methodists. Their polity permitted the creation of General Conference departments and officers for activities that would be beyond the resources of individual conferences or which would create tensions in the matter of supervision. Moreover, the Methodist ministry was accustomed to the practice of supervision of its work by superiors. In contrast, Presbyterian polity placed great emphasis upon the equality of ministers and upon the prerogatives of the presbyteries which were composed of the ministers in relatively small geographic areas. This approach was effective in settled areas in which there were well established churches, but was unsuited to the frontier situation. Therefore the Presbyterians turned to the appointment of mission superintendents who, as agents of the General Assembly, would organize and direct other ministers in the western mission work. This closely resembled the Methodist practice. The Congregationalists were practically paralyzed in their Western work as their polity specifically forbade the use of hierarchical officials and emphasized the self supporting responsibility of the individual congregations. Hence their work was restricted to such locations as could muster enough Congregationalist support to carry itself. There was no adequate provision for the sending out of missionaries to "convert" the settlers and create new work.

Providing sufficient numbers of suitable men for the Western work was perhaps the most difficult problem. In their early years of western work, it appeared as if the Methodists would be the most successful in this regard. Frontier conditions are most readily met by a "sect" approach and the Methodists, especially in their training for the ministry, had retained a fair measure of "sect" qualities. Moreover their itinerant ministry and settlement system assured the servicing of even the most difficult appointments and a reasonable distribution of clerical "talent." However changes were occurring in Methodism that nullified these advantages. As urbanization increased, the Methodists hastened to adjust to its needs which included a more "church" or professional ministry. In a remarkably short time the General Conference modified the college programs to produce ministers with the desired qualifications. The results were disastrous for the West, for these changes were implemented in all the Methodist colleges, east and west, and soon the majority of graduates were unsuited for Western service. Urban centers also preferred to have a voice in the choice of ministers and to have ministers appointed for lengthy periods of time. While the regulations in these matters remained largely untouched, their intentions were subverted, all of which worked to the detriment of the church in the West. The use of laymen and students in the frontier work proved to be inadequate to the problem.

In contrast, the Presbyterians and Congregationalists both started with training programs that produced a "church" or professional ministry that was unsuited to frontier conditions. Both turned to the use of courses that could be completed by men "in the field" that had points of similarity to the program that the Methodists had so readily discarded. However, the Presbyterians modified the old Methodist approach by carefully restricting graduates of their program to service in frontier situations and the Congregationalists set the requirements of their field course far below those of both the Methodists and the Presbyterians.

In summary, the three churches found the financial and personnel problems of the Western work beyond their capacity to solve adequately and the Congregationalists were further burdened by their inability to solve their supervisory and organizational difficulties. The pressure of these difficulties coincided with problems in still another area of church work.

Urbanization-industrialization posed a bewildering variety of challenges to the churches. As people were attracted from rural settings to work opportunities in industry in the cities, the character of the cities underwent major changes. The cities became divided into districts which reflected differences in income and economic interests. As attention became focussed on group or neighbourhood interests, there were sections of the community that lacked both the necessary skills or resources to develop a satisfying way of life. Poverty, as reflected in inadequate food, shelter, and clothing, was not a new phenomenon but in the urban-industrial setting it became concentrated, visible, and self-perpetuating. The cities also produced sections populated by more economically successful workers who suffered less in terms of living conditions but whose economic interests gave them a sense of identity which, like the situation of the slum dwellers, contributed to the destruction of the sense of wider community.

In effect, the churches were challenged to meet the religious needs of quite distinct groups or classes between which there was little communication. In terms of ideology, there were, of course, exceptions in each of the groups but in general terms the upper economic class tended to be "conservative," the middle class "liberal-reformist," and the lower economic class "orgiastic-chiliast."

Presbyterianism and Methodism both were successful in their work with the upper and middle income groups. Congregationalism was less successful in that its "church" orientation did not correspond with the "sect" role which circumstances forced it to assume and it experienced a disheartening leakage of members to other churches, often Presbyterian or Methodist. By reason of the "liberal-reformist" qualities of the churches, there should have been an attraction in them for industrial workers but this did not materialize. The positions in the churches open to laity were generally filled by members of business management who had the required skills, time, and inclination to assume such responsibility. The churches thus appeared to the workers as management-dominated, and they turned in droves to the unions which had exhibited concern for their welfare and in which they did not have to compete with the employers for attention.

Serving the needs of the slum areas presented problems of a different nature. The usual approach of the churches was unsuited. The traditional congregational organization was unsuited because the available laymen were unable to bear the responsibility of office because of lack of experience and often of education. It was even more obvious that congregations in these areas would never be able to become financially self-supporting in a manner comparable to congregations elsewhere. However the most serious problems were related to the ministry and to ideology. The ministers were trained for a "church" type of ministry and were almost totally "conservative" or "liberal-reformist" in ideology, while the people they were sent to serve were generally "orgiastic-chiliast" and were desirous of a more "sect" approach. The people in large numbers turned to the new urban "sect" churches.

Aware of their failure to serve the needs of the frontier and of large segments of the urban populations, the churches began to search for ways to change that would overcome their difficulties. In 1902 the Methodists and Presbyterians began a discussion of a possible union. The Congregationalists immediately took an interest in the possibility of participation in the union. Their situation was even more precarious than that of Methodism or Presbyterianism. Statistics indicated that Congregationalists were in serious decline and might well disappear if they continued their existing practices. Early and active participation in the union discussions offered the possibility of the embodiment of essential Congregationalist principles in the proposed United Church. As a means to consolidating its strength to support the Congregationalist position in the proposed union, or, alternately, to further its chances for survival if union did not take place, the Congregationalists organized a national union of their own in 1906.

During the interim between the proposal of interdenominational union in 1902 and its attainment in 1925, there were major developments in the efforts of the three churches to solve their difficulties. In some cases this was within the framework of the individual denominations; in others it was a matter of interdenominational cooperation.

All three churches undertook to increase the efficiency of their ministries by improving their administration. The Methodists already had an excellent administrative format and their major improvement was the involvement of capable laymen and ministers at all levels. The Presbyterians had a satisfactory administration up to the regional level but lacked integration in their activities at the national level. The introduction of the General Board served to overcome much of the competitiveness and inefficiency at the General Assembly level. The Congregationalists, traditionally opposed to the centralization of authority and only recently in possession of a national organization, gradually assigned increased responsibilities to their regional and national officers. While obviously differing in degrees of progress, it was apparent that the churches were moving toward a common form of administration that was determined by efficiency. In each church, however, there were points that were defended by the "conservatives" without regard for the detrimental results. In some cases the issues had constitutional safeguards that could not be broken. The possibility of a new constitution in a new union converted to the union cause many who were frustrated by the existing constitutions.

Urban problems were approached from two directions. All three churches created departments or standing committees charged with the responsibility of mustering support in the churches to pressure the various levels of government to improve living conditions. In time this activity became strongly marked by cooperation between the various churches and even came to include cooperation with non-religious organizations. At the community level, the various churches experimented with various forms of "institutional churches." These departed from the usual congregations in terms of financing, administration, and programs. Here, too, cooperation between the denominations became general. These changes were prompted by the needs of the Canadian situation; indeed nothing comparable occurred in other countries at the time. The sucess of these innovations was compromised by the failure of the churches to modify their training programs sufficiently to meet the needs of the slums. The addition of sociology enabled the ministers to understand the urban problems, but they were still basically professionals with a "conservative" or "liberal-reform" outlook attempting to serve an "orgiastic-chiliast" constituency which preferred a sectarian approach.

Efforts soon followed to introduce a cooperative approach to the Western work. The mission departments of the Presbyterian and Methodist churches attempted to reduce competition and duplication of efforts by designating areas for each church in which to work. This was not always acceptable to the people in the areas who wanted a church of their own choosing. In many places "Union" congregations were organized upon the proposed "Basis of Union" rather than the polity of the parent denominations which supplied their ministers. This proved quite workable and these congregations became a positive argument for proceeding with the Union. Work with non-English speaking congregations was divided among the churches that were looking to union upon language lines. As in the urban work, such arrangements were unique to Canada and reflected the impact of Canadian needs upon the churches.

More directly related to the training of ministers was the new cooperative work of the colleges. Initially introduced in the colleges of the three churches in Montreal, the idea found its greatest use in the West where resources were most limited and student bodies were restricted because of qualifications imposed by eastern Canada. By 1925 cooperation was practiced by the church colleges in every province west of Ontario. Such arrangements, of course, would have been impossible had it not been for common liberal-reform ideology in all three churches, which permitted departure from the earlier practice of each church training its ministers in isolation. Cooperation in the college work was facilitated by the increasing similarities in the training programs of the churches. While exact comparisons cannot be made, a number of striking similarities are evident. After 1894 the Methodists, like the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, were committed to the objective of training a professional, "church"-type ministry for urban service. The basic training for such a ministry was similar in the three churches. The Congregationalists and the Presbyterians set as their standards a degree in Arts followed by three years of theology but both had non-degree programs that produced men of almost equal training. The Presbyterian alternative program was three years of Arts courses followed by three years of theology while the Congregationalists had a five year program of mixed Arts and theological courses which gave candidates the equivalent of two years of Arts and three of theology. The Methodist program was fundamentally different in that it required completion of two years of field work and study by the probationer prior to college attendance, yet the requirements of the course were remarkably similar to those of the Presbyterian and Congregationalist churches. As of 1922 the candidate for the ministry was expected to have matriculation and sufficient theological knowledge to pass the Preliminary Examinations in Theology. This qualified him as a Probationer and he entered a two year period of field work and study. The courses during this period were a combination of Arts and theology and a measure of course choice was granted to the Probationer. The Probationer then entered college for four years. During the first year the Probationer was to complete studies equivalent to second year Arts. The remaining three years were devoted to theological studies. The alternative course offered by the Methodists offered little in the way of academic concession. A limited number of highly selected men were permitted to enter the Probationary period without university matriculation after passing a rigorous Preliminary Examination but they were not considered as having completed their second Probationary year unless they completed their matriculation. Thereafter their programs were the same as other Probationers. There were, of course, men who followed degree programs. In general terms, they received three years of Arts and three of theology, whereas the Ordinary Course men received the equivalent of two years of Arts and four of theology. By 1925 the basic training for the ministry in all three churches was six years in duration although the Congregationalists permitted ordination after five for non-degree men. Both the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists divided the time equally between Arts and theology, whereas the Methodists gave greater emphasis to theology but would accept approximately equal Arts and theology in the case of degree men.

Course content in the basic training programs of the three churches was quite similar although there were differences in emphasis. All three programs devoted more time to Biblical studies than any other area of the theology program. The Methodists went furthest in this and placed far greater stress upon the New rather than the Old Testament. The other churches took a more balanced approach and gave more attention to Biblical languages. The second strongest area of emphasis was Systematic Theology. The time devoted to it was approximately equal in the three programs but the Congregationalists took a very general approach and the Methodists a very denominational approach. Church History ranked third in terms of the time it was given and the programs were quite similar save for an extra emphasis placed by the Methodists upon the history of Missions. Preaching was given considerable attention by the Methodists, less by the Presbyterians, and least by the Congregationalists. Pastoral Theology was given relatively little but equal time in all three programs. With such similarities in programs, cooperation in college work, even to accepting students from other churches as was the policy of Presbyterian College, Saskatoon, presented little difficulty. There was, however, a sense that the college programs needed change to meet the needs of the times.

The national periods of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches had been inspired by the challenges and opportunities presented by Confederation. Congregational union had come when it was apparent that without it, Congregationalism would have little impact on Canadian life and might decline to impotence. Through the years the "liberal-reformist" elements in the churches found it increasingly easy to identify with the "liberal-reform" ideology of the English-speaking element in the wider Canadian community. At the same time the churches found increasing difficulty in serving the needs of the frontier and the urban working and poverty groups. Interdenominational union was proposed but was resisted by a sizable Presbyterian minority. The delay that followed permitted experimentation with reorganization and cooperation but these proved inadequate. Interdenominational union promised greater possibilities but to many the idea had grown hoary with age. Something was needed to give it the quality of a new and vibrant crusade. The growing sense of Canadian identity and the desire for national autonomy in the 1920's which found expression in Canadian support for the formation of the Commonwealth provided this. The union forces identified their work with Canadian nationalism and union of the three churches was attained in 1925.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. PRIMARY SOURCES

Congregational Church

Congregational Church. *The Canadian Congregational Yearbook.* Toronto, 1873-1925.

Methodist Church

Massey Foundation. *Report of the Massey Foundation Commission on the Secondary Schools and Colleges of the Methodist Church of Canada.* Board of Education of the Methodist Church, 1921.

Methodist Church of Canada. *Book of Discipline (1879).* Toronto, 1879.

Methodist Church. *Journal of the Methodist General Conference.* Toronto, 1883-1924.

Methodist Church. Unpublished "Minutes" of the Board of Education and the Executive Committee, 1906-1910. United Church of Canada Archives.

Presbyterian Church

Canada Presbyterian Church. *Minutes of the General Assembly.* 1869-1875.

Canada Presbyterian Church. *Minutes of the Synod.* 1861-1869.

Presbyterian Church. *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly.* 1875-1925.

Presbyterian Church, Board of Home Missions and Social Service. *Minutes of the Annual Meeting.* 1920-1922.

Presbyterian Church. *Presbyterian Year Book and Almanac for the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland.* Toronto, 1876.

2. BOOKS

Balfour, R. G. *Presbyterianism in the Colonies.* Edinburgh, 1899.

Balowyder, A. *The Winnipeg General Strike.* Toronto, 1967.

Beck, J. M. *Pendulum of Power: Canada's Federal Elections.* Scarborough, 1968.

Beng, E. *The Eastern Orthodox Church, Its Thought and Life.* Garden City, 1963.

Bolger, F. W. P. *Prince Edward Island and Confederation, 1863-1873.* Charlottetown, 1964.

Bonenfant, Jean-C. *The French Canadians and the Birth of Confederation.* Historical Booklet No. 21, Canadian Historical Association, Ottawa, 1966.

Borden, H.(ed.) *Robert Laird Borden: His Memoirs.* 2 vols. Toronto, 1938.

Brown, J. *The Colonial Missions of Congregationalism.* London, 1908.

Brown, R. C. *Canada's National Policy: 1883-1900.* Princeton, 1964.

Buckley, J. M. *A History of Methodists in the United States.* New York, 1896.

Buller, H. *Quebec in Revolt: The Guibord Affair.* Toronto, 1965.

Centennial of Canadian Methodism. Toronto, 1891.

Chown, S. D. *The Story of Church Union in Canada.* Toronto, 1930.

Clark, S. D. *Church and Sect in Canada.* Toronto, 1948.

Clark, S. D. *The Developing Canadian Community.* Toronto, 1962.

Clark. S. D.(ed.) *Urbanism and the Changing Canadian Society.* Toronto, 1961.

Congregational College of Canada. *A Short History and the Plea.* Pamphlet, 1921.

Cooke, R. J. *Religion in Russia under the Soviets.* New York, 1924.

Cornell, P. G. *The Great Coalition.* Historial Booklet No. 19, Canadian Historical Association, Ottawa, 1966.

Creighton, D. *The Empire of the St. Lawrence.* Toronto, 1956.

Creighton, D. *John A. Macdonald: The Old Chieftain.* Toronto, 1955.

Creighton, D. *John A. Macdonald: The Young Politician.* Toronto, 1952.

Creighton, D. *The Road to Confederation.* Toronto, 1964.

Crysdale, S. *The Industrial Struggle and Protestant Ethics in Canada.* Toronto, 1961.

Dafoe, J. W. *Laurier: A Study in Canadian Politics.* 1922, reprint Carleton Library No. 3, Toronto, 1963.

Dawson, R. M. *William Lyon Mackenzie King: A Political Biography: 1874-1923.* Toronto, 1958.

Dru, A. *The Church in the Nineteenth Century: Germany 1800-1918.* London, 1963.

Dunning, A. E. *Congregationalists in America.* New York, 1894.

Earl, D. W. L.(ed.) *The Family Compact: Aristocracy or Oligarchy?* Toronto, 1967.

Fern, V. (ed.) *The American Church of the Protestant Heritage.* New York, 1953.

Ferns, H. A. and B. Ostry. *The Age of Mackenzie King.* London, 1955.

Gargan, E. T. (ed.) *Leo XIII and The Modern World.* New York, 1961.

Gaustad, E. S. *A Religious History of America.* New York, 1966.

Glazebrook, G. P. deT. *A History of Transportation in Canada.* 2 vols. 1938 reprint Carleton Library, Nos. 11, 12, Toronto, 1964.

Gordon, C. W. *The Life of James Robertson, D.D.* Toronto, 1909.

Graham, R. *Arthur Meighen.* 3 vols. Toronto, 1960.

Grant, J. W. (ed.) *The Churches and the Canadian Experience.* Toronto, 1963.

Grant, J. W. *Free Churchmanship in England.* London, n.d., c. 1951.

Grant, W. L. and F. Hamilton. *Principal Grant.* Toronto, 1904.

Gregg, W. *History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada.* Toronto, 1885.

Gregg, W. *Short History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada.* Toronto, 1893.

Gunn, W. T. *His Dominion.* Toronto, 1917.

Hales, E. E. Y. *Pio Nono.* London, 1956.

Hopkins, C. H. *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915.* New Haven, 1940.

Howay, F. W. (ed.) *Builders of the West.* Toronto, 1929.

Hudson, W. S. *American Protestantism.* Chicago, 1961.

Hughes, P. *A Popular History of the Catholic Church.* Garden City, (1947) 1954.

Innis, H. A. *The Fur Trade in Canada.* Toronto, (1930) 1967.

Innis, M. Q. *Economic History of Canada.* Toronto, 1935.

Latourette, K. S. *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age.* Vol. III. The Nineteenth Century Outside Europe. New York, 1961.

Latourette, K. S. *A History of Christianity.* New York, 1953.

Logan, H. A. *Trade Unions in Canada.* Toronto, 1948.

Lossky, L. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church.* London, 1944.

Lower, A. R. M. *Canadians in the Making.* Don Mills, 1958.

Mackinnon, C. *The Life of Principal Oliver.* Toronto, 1936.

Maclean, J. *McDougall of Alberta.* Toronto, 1927.

Mann, W. E. *Sect, Cult and Church in Alberta.* Toronto, 1955.

Mannheim, K. *Ideology and Utopia.* New York, 1936.

Manning, H. T. *The Revolt of French Canada: 1800-35.* Toronto, 1962.

Masters, D. C. *Protestant Church Colleges in Canada.* Toronto, 1966.

Masters, D. C. *Reciprocity, 1846-1911.* Historical Booklet No. 12, Canadian Historical Association, Ottawa, 1965.

Masters, D. C. *The Rise of Toronto: 1850-1890.* Toronto, 1947.

Masters, D. C. *The Winnipeg General Strike.* Toronto, 1947.

McGregor, F. A. *The Rise and Fall of Mackenzie King, 1911-1919.* Toronto, 1962.

McNaught, K. *A Prophet in Politics.* Toronto, 1959.

McNeill, J. T. *The History and Character of Calvinism.* New York, (1954) 1962.

McNeill, J. T. *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925.* Toronto, 1925.

Mead, F. S. *Handbook of Denominations in the United States.* Nashville, 1951.

Moir, J. S. (ed.) *The Cross in Canada.* Toronto, 1966.

Morchain, J. K. and M. Wade. *Search for a Nation.* Toronto, 1967.

Morrow, E. L. *Church Union in Canada.* Toronto, 1923.

Morton, W. L. *The Critical Years: Union of British North America, 1857-1873.* Toronto, 1964.

Morton, W. L. *The Progressive Party of Canada.* Toronto, 1950.

Morton, W. L. *Manitoba.* Toronto, (1957) 1967.

Neatby, H. B. *William Lyon Mackenzie King: The Lonely Heights, 1924-1932.* Toronto, 1963.

Nichols, J. H. *History of Christianity, 1650-1950.* New York, 1956.

Niebuhr, H. R. *Christ and Culture.* New York, 1951.

Niebuhr, H. R. *The Social Sources of Denominationalism.* New York, 1957.

Oliver, E. H. *His Dominion of Canada.* Toronto, 1932.

Oliver, E. H. *The Winning of the Frontier.* Toronto, 1930.

Ormsby, M. A. *British Columbia, A History.* Toronto, 1955.

Ouellet, F. *Louis Joseph Papineau: A Divided Soul.* Historical Booklet No. 11, Canadian Historical Association, Ottawa, 1961.

Phillips, C. E. *The Development of Education in Canada.* Toronto, 1957.

Pidgeon, G. C. *The United Church of Canada: The Story of Union.* Toronto, 1950.

Reaman, C. E. *The Trail of the Huguenots.* London, 1963.

Riddell, J. H. *Methodism in the Middle West.* Toronto, 1946.

Rouse, R. and S. C. Neill. (eds.) *A History of the Ecumenical Movement.* Philadelphia, 1967.

Routley, E. *The Story of Congregationalism.* London, 1961.

Runciman, S. *The Eastern Schism.* Oxford, 1955.

Sanderson, J. E. *The First Century of Methodism in Canada.* Toronto, 1908.

Schmenaan, A. *The Historical Road of Eastern Orthodoxy.* New York, 1963.

Schull, J. *Laurier, The First Canadian.* Toronto, 1965.

Scott, E. *"Church Union" and the Presbyterian Church in Canada.* Montreal, 1928.

Sherrard, P. *The Greek East and the Latin West.* London, 1959.

Shriver, H. G. (ed.) *American Religious Heretics.* Nashville, 1966.

Silcox, C. E. *Church Union in Canada.* New York, 1953.

Silver, A. J. and M. F. Valleur. *The North-West Rebellion.* Toronto, 1967.

Sissons, C. B. *Church and State in Canadian Education.* Toronto, 1959.

Spinka, M. *The Church and the Russian Revolution.* New York, 1927.

Stacey, C. P. *The Undefended Border.* Historical Booklet No. 1, Canadian Historical Association, Ottawa, 1962.

Stanley, G. F. G. *The Birth of Western Canada.* Toronto, (1936) 1963.

Stanley, G. F. G. *Louis Riel.* Historical Booklet No. 2, Canadian Historical Association, Ottawa, 1964.

Stuber, S. I. *How We Got Our Denominations, a Primer on Church History.* New York, 1959.

Sutherland, A. *The Methodist Church and Missions in Canada and Newfoundland.* Toronto, 1906.

Sutherland, A. *Methodism in Canada.* Toronto, 1904.

Sweet, W. W. *Methodism in American History.* Nashville, 1933 (revised 1953).

Sweet, W. W. *The Story of Religion in America.* New York, (1930) 1950.

Thomas, L. H. *The Struggle for Responsible Government in the North-West Territories, 1870-97.* Toronto, 1956.

Thompson, R. E. *A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States.* New York, 1895.

Thomson, D. C. *Alexander Mackenzie: Clear Grit.* Toronto, 1960.

Townsend, W. J., H. B. Workman, and G. Eayrs. (eds.) *A New History of Methodism.* London, 1909.

Villard, P. *Up to the Light, The Story of French Protestantism in Canada.* Toronto, 1928.

Wade, M. *The French Canadians, 1760-1867.* Toronto, (1955) 1968.

Waite, P. B. *The Charlottetown Conference.* Historical Booklet No. 15, Canadian Historical Association, Ottawa, 1963.

Walker, W. *A History of the Christian Church.* Edinburgh, 1918, revised 1959.

Walker, W. *A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States.* New York, 1894.

Walsh, H. H. *The Christian Church in Canada.* Toronto, 1956.

Whitelaw, W. H. *The Quebec Conference.* Historical Booklet No. 20, Canadian Historical Association, Ottawa, 1966.

Wilson, A. *The Clergy Reserves of Upper Canada.* Historical Booklet No. 23, Canadian Historical Association, Ottawa, 1969.

Woodsworth, J. *Thirty Years in the Canadian North-West.* Toronto, 1917.

Wright, J. F. C. *Saskatchewan, The History of a Province.* Toronto, 1955.

Young, C. H. *The Ukrainian Canadians, A Study in Assimilation.* Toronto, 1931.

Zernov, N. *Eastern Christendom.* London, 1961.

3. PERIODICALS

Alberta Historical Review

The British American Presbyterian

The Bulletin

The Canadian Presbyterian

Canadian Annual Review

The Canadian Christian Examiner and Presbyterian Review

The Canadian Congregationalist

Christian Guardian

Canadian Historical Association Annual Report

Canadian Historical Review

The Canadian Independent

Canadian Journal of Theology

Canadian Magazine

Congregationalist and Canadian Independent

Dalhousie Review

The Home and Foreign Record of the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces of British North America

Ontario History

The Presbyterian

The Presbyterian; A Missionary and Religious Record of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland

The Presbyterian Witness

Queen's Quarterly

Saskatchewan History

University of Toronto Quarterly

University Magazine

Westminster

It should be noted that the following abbreviations were used in the footnotes:

C. H. R. **for** *Canadian Historical Review*
U. T. Q. **for** *University of Toronto Quarterly*
Q. Q. **for** *Queen's Quarterly*
C. H. A. **for** *Canadian Historical Association Report*

4. ARTICLES

Alexander, W. H. "In the Beginning," *Alberta Historical Review*, VIII, 2, 1960, 15-20.

Anonymous. "Labour: The Organized Workmen," *Canadian Annual Review*, XIX, 1919, 447-495.

Anonymous. "The New Gospel of Land Settlement," and "Rejoinder," *University Magazine*, XVI, 1917, 100-118.

Antliffe, J. C. "Historical Sketch of the Primitive Methodist Church in Canada," *Centennial of Canadian Methodism*, 187-204.

Ayearst, M. "The Parti Rouge and the Clergy," *Canadian Historical Review* (hereafter quoted as *C. H. R.*), XV, 1934, 390-405.

Bailey, A. G. "Literature and Nationalism after Confederation," *University of Toronto Quarterly* (hereafter quoted as *U. T. Q.*), XXV, 1955-56, 409-423.

Barbeau, M. "French Canada: Its Survival," *Dalhousie Review*, XI, 1931, 433-438.

Barker, E. "Glimpses of College History Half a Century Ago," *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XI, 20, 1904, 4-5.

Barker, H. W. "The Liverpool Congregational Church and Gorham College," Mss., United Church Archives, c. 1945.

Beck, J. M. and D. J. Dooley, "Party Images in Canada," *Queen's Quarterly* (hereafter quoted as *Q. Q.*), LXVII, 1960-61, pp. 431-448.

Belcourt, N. A. "French Canada under Confederation," *Canadian Historical Association* (hereafter quoted as *C. H. A.*) *Annual Report*, 1927, 29-38.

Bell, M. "Toronto's Melting Pot," *Canadian Magazine*, XLI, 1913, 234-242.

Bilodeau, C. "Education in Quebec," *U. T. Q.*, XXVII, 1957-58, 398-412.

Bissell, C. "Literary Taste in Central Canada During the Late Nineteenth Century," *C. H. R.*, XXXI, 1950, 237-249.

Bissett, F. W. "Rt. Hon. Sir John Thompson," *Dalhousie Review*, XXV, 1945, 323-330.

Boyle, G. "The Foreign Missions Committee of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1854-1925," *The Bulletin*, 8, 1955, 37-42.

Brierly, J. S. "Union Government's Opportunities." *University Magazine*, XVII, 1918, 14-27.

Brandeth, H. R. T. "Approaches of the Churches Towards Each Other in the 19th Century," *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (eds.), 1967.

Brown, W. J. "The Farm Labour Problem," *University Magazine*, XII, 1913, pp. 232-245.

Brunet, M. "The British Conquest: Canadian Social Socientists and the Fate of the Canadiens," *C. H. R.*, XL, 1959, 93-107.

Brunet, M. "Quebec's French-Speaking Universities and the Law of Double Imbalance," *Q. Q.*, LXXV, 1967-68, 613-631.

Burke, T. A. "Mackenzie and His Cabinet, 1873-1878," *C. H. R.*, XLI, 1960, 128-148.

Burnet, J. R. "The Urban Community and Changing Moral Standards," *Urbanism and the Changing Canadian Society*, S. D. Clark (ed.), 70-99.

Burns, F. H. "The Grand Collaboration: The Birth of British Columbia," *Q. Q.*, LXV, 1958-59, 195-208.

Burt, A. L. "The Frontier in the History of New France," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1940, 93-99.

Burwash, N. "Methodist Education in Canada," *Centennial of Canadian Methodism*, 301-329.

Caldwell, J. W. "The Unification of Methodism in Canada, 1865-1884," *The Bulletin*, 19, 1967.

Cann, A. W. "All That Was Left," *Christian Guardian*, 7 May 1924, 16.

Careless, J. M. S. "Frontierism, Metropolitanism, and Canadian History," *C. H. R.*, XXXV, 1954, 1-21.

Carman, F. A. "Our Archives and the National Spirit," *Canadian Magazine*, XL, 1912-13, 307-316.

Carter, G. M. "Some Aspects of Canadian Foreign Policy after Versailles," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1943, 94-103.

Cauchy, V. "Philosophy in French Canada: Its Past and Future," *Dalhousie Review*, XLVIII, 1968, 384-399.

Chartier, E. "The Classical Colleges of Quebec," *Q. Q.*, XXXI, 1923-24, 270-288.

Chown, S. D. "Address to the General Conference," *Christian Guardian*, 13 September 1922, 11.

Clark, E. T. "Methodism," *The American Church of the Protestant Heritage,"* V. Fern (ed.), 325-330.

Clark, L. L. "The Conservative Party in the 1890's," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1961, 58-74.

Clark, S. D. "Religious Organization and the Rise of the Canadian Nation, 1850-1885," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1944, 86-96.

Clark, W. C. "The Country Elevator in the Canadian West," *Q. Q.*, XXIV, 1916-17, 46-48.

Clarke, L. H. "Putting a New Front on Toronto," *Canadian Magazine*, XLII, 1913-14, 205-215.

Colvin, J. A. "Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the British Preferential Tariff System," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1955, 13-23.

Cook, G. R. "Church, Schools, and Politics in Manitoba, 1903-1912," *C. H. R.*, XXXIX, 1958, 1-23.

Cooke, A. C. "Empire Unity and Colonial Nationalism, 1894-1911," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1939, 77-86.

Cooke, A. E. "Meanwhile . . . ?" *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XIV, 52, 1907, 10-11.

Cooper, J. I. "The Political Ideas of George Etienne Cartier," *C. H. R.*, XXIII, 1942, 286-294.

Corbett, A. E. "Young Canadians and the Ministry," *Presbyterian and Westminster*, new series XVII, 19, 1920, 461-462.

Corbett, E. A., "Tory of Alberta," *Q. Q.*, LX, 1952-53, 332-343.

Cornell, P. G. "The Alignment of Political Groups in the United Province of Canada 1854-1864," *C. H. R.*, XXX, 1949, 22-46.

Corrigan, B. M. "Canadian Crusaders," *Q. Q.*, XLVII, 1940-41, 77-88.

Craick, W. A. "The Maritime Group of Universities," *Canadian Magazine*, XXXIX, 1912, 321-330.

Creighton, D. G. "Economic Nationalism and Confederation," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1942, 44-51.

Creighton, D. G. "The United States and Canadian Confederation," *C. H. R.*, XXXIX, 1958, 209-222.

Dafoe, J. W. "Canada and the Peace Conference of 1919," *C. H. R.*, XXIV, 1943, 233-248.

Deems, M. M. "The Congregational Christian Churches," *The American Church of the Protestant Heritage*, V. Ferm (ed.).

Drury, C. M. "The Presbyterian Church in America," *The American Church of the Protestant Heritage*, V. Ferm (ed.).

Elliott, J. "The Education of the Clergy," *Q. Q.*, January, 1895, 224-234.

Ellis, L. E. "Canada's Rejection of Reciprocity in 1911," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1939, 99-111.

Falconer, R. A. "The Tradition of Liberal Education in Canada," *C. H. R.*, VIII, 1927, 99-118.

Ferns, H. S. and B. Ostry. "Mackenzie King and the First World War," *C. H. R.*, XXXVI, 1955, 93-112.

Foster, G. E. "Reciprocity with the United States," *University Magazine*, IX, 1910, 550-562.

Fraser, A. M. "The Nineteenth Century Negotiations for Confederation of Newfoundland with Canada," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1949, 14-20.

Fraser, B. "The Political Career of Sir Hector Louis Langevin," *C. H. R.*, XLII, 1961, 93-132.

Fullerton, A. "Our Homesteaders," *Canadian Magazine*, XLVI, 1915-16, 249-258.

Galbraith, J. S. "Land Policies of the Hudson's Bay Company, 1870-1913," *C. H. R.*, XXXII, 1951, 1-21.

Gibbon, J. M. "The Foreign Born," *Q. Q.*, XXVII, 1920-21, 331-351.

Gibson, J. A. "The Colonial Office View of Canadian Federation 1856-1868," *C. H. R.*, XXXV, 1954, 279-313.

Gibson, J. A. "Mr. Mackenzie King and Canadian Autonomy, 1921-1946," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1951, 12-21.

Goodfellow, J. C. "Origins of the United Church of Canada in British Columbia," *The Bulletin*, 7, 1954, 33-36.

Gordon, J. L. "Western Congregationalism vs. Church Union," *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XV, 19, 1908, 6-7.

Goudge, T. A. "A Century of Philosophy in English-Speaking Canada," *Dalhousie Review*, XLVII, 1967, 537-549.

Graham, W. R. "Meighen and the Montreal Tycoons: Railway Policy in the Election of 1921," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1957, 71-85.

Grant, G. M. "The Down-Town and the Up-Town Church," *Westminster*, New series VIII, 21, 1900, 594-595.

Grant, J. W. "The Church and Canada's Self Awareness," *Canadian Journal of Theology*, XIII, 3, 1967.

Greening, W. E. "The Changing Labor Picture in French Canada," *Dalhousie Review*, XXXVI, 1956, 156-162.

Grindley, T. W. "Wheat in the Canadian West," *Q. Q.*, XXXVII, 1930-31, 370-385.

Gunn, W. T. "Our Home Missions Progress for 1908," *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XV, 6, 1908, 6-7.

Hammond, M. O. "The Tragedy of Reciprocity," *Canadian Magazine*, XXXVIII, 1911-1912, 84-91.

Harper, J. M. "Ethical Organization in Canada," *Q. Q.*, XIV, 1906-07, 189-195.

Harris, R. S. "Higher Education In Canada," *Dalhousie Review*, XLII, 1962, 423-436.

Harvey, D. C. "The Dalhousie Idea," *Dalhousie Review*, XVII, 1937, 131-143.

Harvey, D. C. "Dalhousie University Established," *Dalhousie Review*, XVIII, 1938, 50-66.

Harvey, D. C. "The Early Struggles of Dalhousie," *Dalhousie Review*, XVII, 1937, 311-326.

Harvey, D. C. "From College to University," *Dalhousie Review*, XVII, 1937, 411-431.

Harvey, D. C. "The Maritime Provinces and Confederation," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1927, 39-45.

Hodgetts, J. E. "Our Early Peripatetic Government," *Q. Q.*LIX, 1951-52, 316-322.

Hoffman, M. J. "The Reformed Church in America," *The American Church of the Protestant Heritage*, V. Ferm (ed.).

Hopkins, J. C. "Canadian Life and Character," *University Magazine*, VIII, 1909, 291-304.

Howay, F. W. "British Columbia's Entry into Confederation," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1927, 67-73.

Hutchinson, G. "Early Methodist Missions," *Alberta Historical Review*, VI, 4, 1958, 1-6.

Innis, H. A. "Significant Factors in Canadian Economic Development," *C. H. R.*, XVIII, 1937, 374-384.

Irving, J. A. "The Development of Philosophy in Central Canada from 1850 to 1900." *C. H. R.*, XXXI, 1950, 252-287.

Irving, J. A. "One Hundred Years of Canadian Philosophy," *U. T. Q.*, XX, 1950-51, 107-123.

Johnston, H., "Historical Sketch of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Upper and Lower Canada," *Centennial of Canadian Methodism*, 55-94.

Jordan, W. G. "Queen's and the Church," *Q. Q.*XVI, 1909-10, 258-260.

Jordan, W. G., "The Standard of Ministerial Education," *Q. Q.*, XIX, 1912-13, 202-213.

Jordan, M. E. "George Millward McDougall, Missionary and Nation Building," *Alberta Historical Review*, III, 1, 1955, 24-33.

Jordan, M. E. "Henry Bird Steinhauer and His Whitefish Lake Mission," *Alberta Historical Review*, III, 4, 1955, 11-13.

Karlstrom, N. "Movements for International Friendship and Life and Work," *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (eds.).

Keenleyside, H. L. "British Columbia--Annexation or Confederation?" *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1928, 34-40.

Keirstead, W. C. "The University of New Brunswick, Past and Present," *Dalhousie Review*, XXII, 1942, 344-354.

Kennedy, H. A. "Father Lacombe," *Builders of the West*, F. W. Howay (ed.).

Kennedy, W. P. M. "The Nature of Canadian Federalism," *C. H. R.*, II, 1921, 106-125.

Lamb, W. K. "A Bent Twig in British Columbia History," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1948, 86-92.

Lanctot, G. "Garneau, Fondateur De L'Histoire Scientifique en Canada," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1925, 28-33.

Landon, F. "D'Alton McCarthy and the Politics of the Later 'Eighties," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1932, 43-50.

LaPierre, L. L. "Joseph Israel Tarte and the McGreevy-Langevin Scandal," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1961, 47-57.

Latourette, K. S. "Ecumenical Bearings of the Missionary Movement and the International Missionary Council," *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (eds.).

Lavelle, A. E. "Theological Education and the Methodist Church," *Christian Guardian*, 28 November 1906, 9-10.

Lathern, J. "Historical Sketch of Methodism in the Eastern Provinces," *Centennial of Canadian Methodism*, 35-45.

Leger, J.-M. "Aspects of French-Canadian Nationalism," *U. T. Q.*, XXVII, 1957-58, 310-329.

Lingard, C. C. "Economic Forces Behind the Demand for Provincial Status in the Old North-West Territories," *C. H. R.*, XXI, 1940, 254-267.

Lochead, . "The Church and the Rural Community." *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XX, 19, 1913, 9-11; 50, 8-12; 51, 10-11.

Lockhart, A. D. "The Contribution of Macdonald Conservatism to National Unity, 1854-1878," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1939; 124-132.

Low, G. L. "Evolution in Relation to Christian Thought," *Q. Q.*, IV, 1898-1899, 85-97.

Lower, A. R. M. "In Unknown Quebec," *U. T. Q.*, VI, 1936-37, 89-102.

MacBeth, R. C. "The Story of Manitoba College," *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXIV, 41, 1921, 8-10.

MacFarlane, R. O. "Manitoba Politics and Parties After Confederation," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1940, 45-55.

MacGlashen, J. A. "The Change of a Hundred Years: Centenary of the Presbyterian College, Pine Hill," *Presbyterian and Westminster*, New series VIII, 15, 387-389.

MacKinnon, F. "Communications Between P. E. I. and the Mainland," *Dalhousie Review*, XXIX, 1949, 182-190.

MacKinnon, F. "David Laird of Prince Edward Island," *Dalhousie Review*, XXVI, 1946, 405-421.

Mackintosh, W. A. "The Canadian Wheat Pools," *Q. Q.*, III, 1925-26, 115-142.

MacNab, J. E. "Toronto's Industrial Growth to 1891," *Ontario History*, XLVII, 1955.

MacNutt, W. S. "Why Halifax was Founded," *Dalhousie Review*, XII, 1932, 524-532.

Magney, W. H. "The Methodist Church and the National Gospel, 1884-1914. *The Bulletin*, XX, 1968.

Magwood, J. M. "A Change in Our Theological Curriculum Imperative," *Christian Guardian*, 3 June 1914, pp. 8-9.

Maheux, A. "French Canadians and Democracy," *U. T. Q.*, XXVII, 1957-58, 341-351.

Martin, C. "Confederation and the West," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1927, 20-28.

Martin, C. "The Completion of Confederation," *Q. Q.*, XXXVIII, 1931-32, 197-210.

Martin, C. "The First 'New Province' of the Dominion," *C. H. R.*, I, 1920, 354-378.

Maxwell, J. A. "Lord Dufferin and the Difficulties with British Columbia, 1874-7," *C. H. R.*, XII, 1931, 364-389.

Maxwell, J. A. "Prince Edward Island and Confederation," *Dalhousie Review*, XIII, 1933, 53-60.

McBride, W. D. "What of the West," *University Magazine*, VIII, 1909, 274-290.

McConica, J. K. "Kingsford and Whiggery in Canadian History," *C. H. R.*, XL, 1959, 108-120.

McCulloch, W. E. "The United Presbyterian Church in America," *The American Church of the Protestant Heritage*, V. Ferm (ed.).

McDougall, J. L. "The Frontier School and Canadian History," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1929, 121-125.

McKee, S. "Canada's Bid for the Traffic of the Middle West," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1940, 26-35.

McLeod, A. "The Church and the Man," *Q. Q.*, XIII, 1905-06, 48-58.

McNeill, J. T. "The Making of the Presbyterian Church in Canada," *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXVIII, 18, 1926, 6-8.

Melvin, G. G. "Maritime Union," *University Magazine*, VIII, 1909, 436-442.

Minville, E. "Economic and Social Tendencies of French Canada," *U. T. Q.*, XIX, 1949-50, 141-157.

Mitchell, H. "The Grange in Canada," *Q. Q.*, XXII, 1914-15, 164-183.

Moir, J. "The Settlement of the Clergy Reserves: 1840-1855," *C. H. R.*, XXXVII, 1956, 46-62.

Morrison, H. M. "The Background of the Free Homestead Law of 1872," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1935, 58-66.

Morton, W. L. "Clio in Canada: The Interpretation of Canadian History," *U. T. Q.*, XV, 1945-46, 227-234.

Morton, W. L. "Direct Legislation and the Origins of the Progressive Movement," *C. H. R.*, XXV, 1944, 279-288.

Morton, W. L. "The Extension of the Franchise in Canada," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1943, 72-81.

Morton, W. L. "Manitoba Schools and Canadian Nationality, 1890-1913," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1951, 51-59.

Morton, W. L. "The Western Progressive Movement, 1919-1921," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1946, 41-54.

Murdoch, V. "The Abbe Groulx," *Q. Q.*, LXIII, 1956-57, 179-187.

Murray, J. E. "The Contest for the University of Saskatchewan," *Saskatchewan History*, XII, 1959, 1-22.

Murray, J. E. "The Early History of Emmanuel College," *Saskatchewan History*, IX, 1956, 81-101.

Murray, J. E. "The Provincial Capitol Controversy in Saskatchewan," *Saskatchewan History*, V, 1952, 81-105.

Murray, R. "Presbyterianism in the Sea Provinces: An Historical Sketch," *Westminster*, New Series VIII, 21, 1900, 629-632.

Murray, W. "The Colleges and the Church," *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXV, 29, 1922, 9.

Murray, W. "The Problem of the Church Colleges," *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXV, 31, 1922, 10.

Murray, W. C. "University Development Since Confederation," *Dalhousie Review*, VII, 1927, 479-48

Neatby, H., R. A. Preston and M. Brunet, "Canadianism--A Symposium," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1956, 74-82.

Neatby, H. B. "Laurier and Imperialism," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1955, 24-32.

Neill, S. C. "Division and the Search for Unity Prior to the Reformation," *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (eds.).

Oliver, E. H. "The Problems of Saskatchewan," *Presbyterian Witness*, LXXIV, 28, 1921, 11-13.

Oliver, E. H. "The University of Saskatchewan," 1910, reprinted *Saskatchewan History*, XII, 1959, 72-73.

Ormsby, M. A. "Canada and the New British Columbia," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1948, 74-85.

Ormsby, M. A. "Prime Minister Mackenzie, The Liberal Party, and the Bargain with British Columbia," *C. H. R.*, XXVI, 1945, 148-173.

Passmore, F. "Methodist Memories of Saskatchewan," *Saskatchewan History*, VIII, 1955, 11-16.

Prang, M. "Clerics, Politicians and the Bilingual Schools Issue in Ontario, 1910-1917," *C. H. R.*, XLI, 1960, 281-307.

Prang, M. "N. W. Rowell and Canada's External Policy, 1917-1921," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1960, 83-103.

Prior, A. E. "Canadian Congregationalism Again," *The Canadian Congregationalist*, VII, 33, 1901, 4-5.

Riddell, R. G. "A Cycle in the Development of the Canadian West," *C. H. R.*, XXI, 1940, 268-284.

Riddell, W. R. "International Trade Relations and Reciprocity between Canada and the United States," *Q. Q.*, XIX, 1911-1912, 330-339.

Rimmington, G. T. "The Founding of Universities in Nova Scotia," *Dalhousie Review*, XLVI, 1966, 319-335.

Robin, M. "The Working Class and the Transition to Capitalist Democracy in Canada," *Dalhousie Review*, XLVII, 1967, 326-339.

Roe, F. G. "Early Opinions on the 'Fertile Belt' of Western Canada," *C. H. R.*, XXVII, 1946, 131-149.

Rogers, G. M. "The Story of a Nova Scotia College" (Gorham College), *Dalhousie Review*, XVIII, 1938, 494-512.

Ross, D. "A Present Trend," *Q. Q.*, 1893-1894, 12-17.

Rouse, R. "Voluntary Movements and the Changing Ecumenical Climate," *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, R. Rouse and S. C. Neill, (eds.).

Sage, W. N. "British Columbia Becomes Canadian," *Q. Q.*, LII, 1945-46, 168-183.

Sage, W. N. "Geographical and Cultural Aspects of the Five Canadas," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1937, 28-34.

Sage, W. N. "Vancouver: The Rise of a City," *Dalhousie Review*, XVII, XVII, 1937, 49-54.

Saunders, R. M. "History and French Canadian Survival," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1943, 25-34.

Scholfield, J. W. "The Harmonization of United Brethren Usages with Congregational Principles," *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XIV, 3, 1907, 10-12.

Schwandt, R. H. "The Life and Work of Leo XIII," *Leo XIII and the Modern World*, E. T. Gargan. (ed.).

Scott, F. R. "The Privy Council and Minority Rights," *Q. Q.*, XXXVII, 1929-30, 668-678.

Shortt, A. "Life of the Settler in Western Canada Before the War of 1812," *Q. Q.*, XXII, 1914-15, 71-88.

Shortt, A. "The Winning of Responsible Government in Canada," *Q. Q.*, X, 1902-03, 142-154.

Sibley, C. L. "Canada's Great National Port," *Canadian Magazine*, LX, 1922-23, 128-134.

Simpson, G. W. "The Blending of Traditions in Western Canadian Settlement," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1944, 46-52.

Sinclair, A. G. "The Union Situation," *The Presbyterian*, New series XXVIII, 5, 1916, 107-108.

Sinclair, J. A. "Does Historical Criticism Do Violence to Special Revelation?" *Q. Q.*, I, 1893-1894, 289-297.

Sissons, C. B. "Illiteracy in the West," *University Magazine*, XII, 1913, 440-451.

Sissons, C. B. "University Federation at Toronto: A Canadian Experiment," *C. H. R.*, XXXI, 1950, 166-176.

Smith, A. J. M. "Our Poets: A Sketch of Canadian Poetry in the Nineteenth Century," *U. T. Q.*, XII, 1942-43, 75-94.

Smith, H. L. "Borden Parker Bowne: Heresy at Boston," *American Religious Heretics*, G. H. Shriver (ed.), 148-179.

Smith, J. P. "American Republican Leadership and the Movement for the Annexation of Canada in the 1860's," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1935, 67-75.

Soward, F. H. "Sir Robert Borden and Canada's External Policy, 1911-1920," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1941, 65-82.

Stacey, C. P. "British Military Policy in Canada in the Era of Confederation," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1934, 20-29.

Stacey, C. P. "The Fenian Troubles and Canadian Military Development, 1865-1871," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1935, 26-35.

Stacey, C. P. "The Military Aspect of Canada's Winning of the West, 1870-1885," *C. H. R.*, XXI, 1940, 1-24.

Stanley, G. F. G. "Act or Pact, Another Look at Confederation," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1956, 1-25.

Stanley, G. F. G. "Western Canada and the Frontier Thesis," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1940, 105-117.

Stapleford, F. N. "The Minister and His Training," *Christian Guardian*," 10 April 1918, 6-7.

Stevenson, J. "Sectionalism in Canada," *U. T. Q.*, V, 1935, 72-91.

Stone, S. G. "Historical Sketch of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada," *Centennial of Canadian Methodism*, 122-180.

Thomas, L. G. "The Liberal Party in Alberta: 1905-21," *C. H. R.*, XXVIII, 1947, 411-427.

Thomson, D. W. "The Fate of Titles in Canada," *C. H. R.*, X, 1929, 236-246.

Trotter, R. G. "Sir Robert Borden," *Q. Q.*, XLVI, 1939-40, 334-340.

Trotter, R. G. "Why Confederation Came," *Q. Q.*, XLV, 1938-39, 22-29.

Turcotte, E. and B. K. Sandwell. "The Future of Unity in Canada: Two Views," *U. T. Q.*, XIV, 1944-45, 117-134.

Underhay, F. C. "Sir Robert Borden and Imperial Relations," *Dalhousie Review*, X, 1930, 503-517.

Upton, L. F. S., "In Search of Canadian History," *Q. Q.*, LXXIV, 1966-67, 674-682.

Waite, P. B. "The Quebec Resolutions and Le Courrier du Canada, 1864-1865," *C. H. R.*, XL, 1959, 294-303.

Waite, P. B. "Sir John A. Macdonald: The Man," *Dalhousie Review*, XLVII, 1967, 143-158.

Wales, J. G. "The Village and the Nation," *University Magazine*, VIII, 1909, 561-572.

Warriner, W. H. "College Sunday--An Appeal," *The Canadian Congregationalist*, XXIV, 30, 1917, 3.

Watson, J. "Thirty Years in the History of Queen's University, *Q. Q.*, X, 1902-03, 188-196.

Watt, F. W. "The Theme of 'Canada's Century', 1896-1920," *Dalhousie Review*, XXXVIII, 1958, 154-166.

Waugh, W. T. "The Development of Imperial Relations," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1927, 82-88.

Webber, G. "Bible Christian Church," *Centennial of Canadian Methodism*, 205-216.

Webster, J. C. "Canadian Cultural Development," *C. H. A. Annual Report*, 1927, 74-81.

Weigel, G. "Leo XIII and Contemporary Theology," *Leo XIII and the Modern World*, E. T. Gargan, ed.

Weston, P. E. "A University for Calgary," *Alberta Historical Review*, XI, 3, 1963, 1-11.

Whitelaw, W. M. "Reconstructing the Quebec Conference," *C. H. R.*, XIX, 1938, 123-137.

Williams, W. "Historical Sketch of the Methodist New Connexion Church in Canada," *Centennial of Canadian Methodism*, 95-121.

Willms, A. M. "Conscription 1917: A Brief for the Defense," *C. H. R.*, XXXVII, 1956, 338-351.

Woodsworth, J. S. "Nation Building," *University Magazine*, XVI, 1917, 85-99.

Woodsworth, J. S. "The Training of Our Ministers," *Christian Guardian*, 25 May 1910, 10-11.

Wrong, G. M. "The Beginnings of Historical Criticism in Canada: A Retrospect, 1896-1936," *C. H. R.*, XVII, 1936, 1-8.

Yeigh, F. "The Biggest Business in Canada," *Canadian Magazine*, LIV, 1919-1920, 283-293.

Yoder, D. H. "Christian Unity in 19th Century America," *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (eds.).

Zaslow, M. "The Frontier Hypothesis in Recent Histiography," *C. H. R.*, XXIX, 1948, 153-166.

5. UNPUBLISHED THESES

Boyle, G. A. "Higher Criticism and the Struggle for Academic Freedom in Canadian Methodism." Unpublished Th.D. Dissertation, Victoria University, 1965.

Krug, C. A. Interview. January, 1968.

Schwarz, E. R. "Jabez Bunting, Wesleyan Methodist Churchman." Unpublished S.T.M. Thesis, Southern Methodist University, 1958.

Schwarz, E. R. "Samuel Dwight Chown, An Architect of Canadian Church Union." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston University, 1961.